A.M.1930 n
H.E.Nelson
c.1

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF The Author

A.M. 1930
n
c1

June 1930

44513

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

# THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR

Submitted by

Harold Edward Nelson

(A.B., Puget Sound, 1926)

In partial fulfilment of requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

1930

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

44515

378.744
BO
A.M. 1930
n
c.1

# OUTLINE


| Heading | Page |
|---|---|
| I. INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE AND SCOPE | 1 |
| II. THE ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS TAUGHT BY JESUS | 4 |
| 1. The reaction of Jesus to the use of force and the sword | 4 |
| 2. His striking emphasis upon the value of human life, either physical or spiritual | 10 |
| 3. The application of the sixth commandment | 11 |
| 4. Illustrations used by Jesus which touch upon the military life of his day | 12 |
| 5. Soldiers who came in touch with Jesus and were honored by him | 13 |
| 6. The relationship of the followers of Jesus to government | 14 |
| 7. Teachings from which certain inferences can be drawn | 15 |
| III. THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS TAUGHT BY THE APOSTLES | 18 |
| 1. The reaction of the Apostles to the use of force and the sword | 19 |
| 2. An emphasis upon the value of human life, either physical or spiritual | 20 |
| 3. The application of the sixth commandment | 20 |
| 4. Illustrations used by the Apostles which touch upon the military life of their day | 21 |
| 5. The Apostles' contact with soldiers | 23 |
| 6. The relationship of the Apostles to government and authority | 24 |
| 7. Teachings from which certain inferences can be drawn | 26 |

Heading Page

IV. THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS PORTRAYED BY THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS AND OTHER WRITERS OF THE PERIOD, A.D. 70-200..... 30

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force..... 31

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment..... 32

3. The relation of the Christian to government... 34

4. Love for one's enemies..... 35

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe..... 37

6. Illustrations used by the Fathers which touch upon military life..... 40

7. References which bear directly upon the war system..... 42

V. THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS PRESENTED BY THIRD CENTURY WRITERS..... 48

A. The View of Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 153-217 48

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force..... 49

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment..... 49

3. The relation of the Christian to government 51

4. Love for one's enemies..... 53

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe..... 55

6. Illustrations which touch upon military life..... 57

7. References which bear directly upon the war system..... 58

B. The View of Tertullian of Carthage, A.D. 145-220 62

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force..... 62

Heading Page

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment..... 64

3. The relation of the Christian to government..... 66

4. Love for one's enemies..... 69

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe..... 70

6. Illustrations used which touch upon military life..... 72

7. References which bear directly upon the war system..... 75

C. The View of Other Third Century Writers..... 83

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force..... 83

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment..... 85

3. The relation of the Christian to government 87

4. Love for one's enemies..... 89

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe..... 90

6. Illustrations used which touch upon military life..... 93

7. References which bear directly upon the war system..... 100

a. The nature of war as viewed by these Christian writers..... 100

b. The causes of war..... 101

c. The problem of the Christian as a part both of the church and the war system 102

Heading Page

VI. THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS EXISTENT JUST PRIOR TO THE ACCESSION OF CONSTANTINE, c. A.D. 306 108

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force..... 109

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment..... 111

3. The relationship of the Christian to government..... 112

4. Love for one's enemies..... 114

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe..... 115

6. Illustrations which touch upon military life. 117

7. References which bear directly upon the war system..... 120

a. The total lack of harmony between warfare and Christianity..... 120

b. The permissibility of warfare under certain conditions..... 122

c. The participation in the war system and in warfare of Christian soldiers..... 123

VII. THE GENERAL HISTORICAL REFERENCES AS GIVEN BY LATER HISTORIANS..... 127

VIII. CONCLUSION..... 137

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 145

# I. INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Every age has characteristics which are peculiar to itself. Within certain time limits these reveal such a dominating influence that history is broken up into epochs or periods. Hence it is that the centuries from the birth of Christ until the accession of Constantine (A.D. 306-337) may be taken as a period for definite study.

A rich deposit of literature remains, having come from the active pen of men living under the conditions which marked the period indicated above. These men were vitally interested in certain definite subjects, and gave to the world in written form the contents of their minds. In doing this it was inevitable that certain clearly evident attitudes would be brought to the surface.

It is the purpose of this thesis to determine, if possible, one of these attitudes--not that this one can be entirely separated from the others with which it is inextricably interwoven, but that sufficient distinctness can be discerned to make such a determination somewhat attainable.

The attitude referred to is that toward war. The group revealing the attitude is the Christian, few in number from the beginning, but increasing in numerical power until a tremendous public force was exerted. The main question to be considered is, "What did these Christians

think was their proper relationship to the activity among men called warfare?" This question, of course, is so intertwined with thinking of other natures and in different fields that it cannot be considered as answerable from the bare study of the war-thought alone; it must be taken along with other phases of activity and thought which are closely related. These related fields will, therefore, be studied nearly as extensively as the distinct war attitude itself.

It is intended that every contributory piece of literature--but especially Christian--of the period beginning with the teachings of Jesus and ending with the approximate date of the accession of Constantine should be studied and made to reveal the light on the subject which it contains. Generous quotations are incorporated in this thesis in order to discern how the writer obtained his conclusions and also to give the reader the opportunity to make for himself any possible conclusions other than the ones reached here.

Added to the study of the original sources of the period in mind are the conclusions of various historians who have viewed the early Christian age and have expressed their opinions. Not only the histories of the Church, but wherever it has been possible with the limited textbooks accessible, secular history has been examined to discover the opinions there, with, of course, in the latter case, negligible results.

It is hoped that as little as possible of the prejudice of the writer will shine through the conclusions reached. But that bias should be entirely absent would be asking too much, for neither has it been lacking in the work of reputable writers of church history.

## II. THE ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS TAUGHT BY JESUS

Jesus gave no explicit teachings concerning the relationship of his followers to war. The question was not an acute one, since the Jews were exempt from service in the Roman legions.[1] But certain principles were enunciated by Jesus, and these give us a relative idea of the stand he would have taken had he been called upon definitely to teach his disciples on the subject.

The best that can be done is to review briefly all the possible implicit instructions. This will be done along the line of the following divisions: 1. The reaction of Jesus to the use of force and the sword; 2. His striking emphasis upon the value of human life, either physical or spiritual; 3. The application of the sixth commandment; 4. Illustrations used by Jesus which touch upon the military life of the day; 5. Soldiers who came in touch with Jesus and were honored by him; 6. The relationship of the followers of Jesus to government; 7. Teachings from which certain inferences can be drawn.

1. The reaction of Jesus to the use of force and the sword.

Jesus had to meet for himself the temptation to employ force to introduce and advance his spiritual Kingdom of God.

---

[1] Wellock, War As Viewed by Jesus and the Early Church, p. 6.

The third Temptation[1] has been interpreted to indicate the rejection of force by Jesus.[2] The kingdoms of the world could be stormed only by the methods employed by the Devil and thus won to Christ and his kingdom. These methods Jesus refused to use.

The Sermon on the Mount is bristling with opposition to the employment of force.[3] "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth."[4] "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy."[5] "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God."[6] "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but

---

[1] Mt. 4:8-11.

[2] Wellock, War As Viewed by Jesus and the Early Church, p. 6: "At the temptation Jesus rejected the idea of taking possession of the kingdoms of the world, which apparently could only be done through violence." Page, The Sword or the Cross, p. 30: "One of the great temptations of his life came at this point." Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 57: "The most natural interpretation . . . of the temptation of Jesus to do homage to Satan in order to obtain the kingdoms of the world as his own, strongly confirms the results at which we have arrived . . . We may say that no other assumption so clearly explains both the temptation and the way it was met, than the assumption that Jesus felt that the one practical means of winning the lordship of the world speedily and completely, that is to say, the use of arms, was forbidden to him . . . To have taken arms, therefore, would have been to him disobedience to God . . ." Simkhovitch, Toward the Understanding of Jesus, p. 47: "Jesus was against resistance to Rome . . ."

[3] Wellock, War As Viewed by Jesus and the Early Church, p. 6: "Practically the whole of the Sermon on the Mount is a frontal attack upon conventional morality, the accepted codes of conduct regarding property, violence, and social relations generally."

I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."[1]

The same resistance to force is found elsewhere. "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves."[2] In meeting the demand for an explanation of his purpose Jesus replied, "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."[3]

Jesus was concerned, however, over the fate of the nation of which he was a part.[4] But so were the other Jews. "The primary concern of the Pharisees and priests was also the fate of the nation. The Pharisees could probably have overlooked the heresies of Christ's religious teachings, as they overlooked those of the Sadducees, who denied such traditional canons as the immortality of the soul. The great and fundamental cleavage was constituted by Christ's non-resistance to Rome. Of course they could not use that as an accusation when they were seeking his condemnation at the hands of a

---

[1] Mt. 5:38, 39. Simkhovitch, Toward the Understanding of Jesus, p. 53, uses this verse in the following: "Why then should Jesus assume that his followers will be reviled and persecuted? Is it because of the Christhood of Jesus? But did not his own people in Nazareth try to kill him before he acknowledged his Christhood? One does not need to look very far to find the reason for the antagonism to Jesus. Was it not he who in the midst of the brewing rebellion was teaching: 'That ye resist not evil . . ?'"

[2] Mt. 10:16. [3] Jn. 18:36. [4] Lk. 19:41-44.

Roman procurator, and they had to invent some other charges."[1]

What place was left for force when Jesus rejected its use even in relation to one's enemies? "But love your enemies, and do them good, and lend, never despairing; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High; for he is kind toward the unthankful and evil."[2]

There is one instance in which Jesus is pictured as using force, at least in appearance; in his encounter with the money changers in the temple he used a scourge of cords.[3] The account does not say that he struck any person with it;[4] nor is it readily conceivable that Jesus, the scorner of resistance, would so far forget himself as to attempt to drive away by mere physical force a group of men who had permission to continue their business where they were. It must have been moral, not physical, power that accomplished that end.

Jesus taught the repudiation of the Gentile method of

---

[1] Simkhovitch, Toward the Understanding of Jesus, p. 41.

[2] Lk. 6:35; cf. Mt. 5:43; Jn. 6:27.

[3] Jn. 2:13-16. Cf. Mt. 21:12-16; Mk. 11:15-18. John alone mentions the scourge of cords. Moffatt's translation of the New Testament reads as follows: "Making a scourge of cords, he drove them all, sheep and cattle together, out of the temple, scattered the coins of the brokers, and upset their tables . . ." Physical force is more evident here than in the translation of the American Standard Revised Edition.

[4] Wellock, War As Viewed by Jesus and the Early Church; p. 8. "Manifestly either the use of the whip was confined to the cattle, or was intended as a sign of disapproval." Page, The Sword or the Cross, p. 32: "The very most that can be said in this regard is that Jesus sanctions the use of force. To say this is not proof that Jesus sanctions war. War involves many other factors than the mere use of force."

subordinating men. "Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."[1] Lording over men and exercising authority could only be maintained by force.[2]

A definite denunciation of the sword was made by Jesus in the midst of the dramatic encounter in the garden. The authorities had come to take him by force and bring him to judgment. In the excitement of the moment "one of them that were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his ear. Then saith Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."[3] Certainly no clearer statement could be made.

In the ordinary course of his instructions Jesus made references to the sword. There has been some disagreement

---

[1] Mt. 20:25-28. Also Mk. 10:42-44.

[2] Cf. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 41, 44: "Several lines of evidence converge on the conclusion that Jesus disapproved of and rejected . . . the use of physical violence and punishment . . . we get a confirmation of this view in our third piece of evidence, which concerns his disapproval of gentile 'authority,' as expressed in the following words addressed to the Twelve. 'Ye know that those who are reckoned to rule over the gentiles lord it over them . ."

[3] Mt. 26:51, 52. Cf. Mk. 14:47.

as to interpretation, but the context makes fairly clear the meaning intended by Jesus. "Think not that I came," he tells the people, "to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law: and a man's foes shall be they of his own household."[1] It seems to be stretching a point to make this out to mean that Jesus sanctioned the use of the sword. He is speaking rather of the clash of convictions regarding his teachings.[2]

At the end of the ministry of Jesus there occurs an interesting little incident. "And he said unto them, When I sent you forth without purse and wallet, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing. And he said unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet; and he that hath none, let him sell his cloak, and buy a sword. For I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with Transgressors: for that which concerneth me hath fulfilment. And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough."[3] Could Jesus have been talking

---

[1] Mt. 10:34-26.

[2] Page, The Sword or the Cross, p. 33: "It is to be doubted if a single reputable Biblical scholar can be found who will interpret these words to mean that Jesus had reference to a literal sword as a means of accomplishing a desired end." Wellock, War As Viewed by Jesus and the Early Church, p. 8: "Jesus is clearly referring to the fierce antipathies which his teaching had already created and would continue to create."

[3] Lk. 22:35-38.

about a literal sword when two were enough for the group with him? It would appear evident that the disciples failed to understand the spiritual significance of the remarks.

An illustration with a background of force is used by Jesus. "When the strong man fully armed guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him his whole armor wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils."[1] This illustration shows both the strength and the weakness of armed force, peace when the strong is surrounded by only the weaker, but destruction when a stronger comes. It seems clear that Jesus never intended this as a sanction of force.

2. His striking emphasis upon the value of human life, either physical or spiritual.

The whole ministry of Jesus is characterized by a high regard for personality. The sick always moved him with compassion. Little children he taught were already in the kingdom of heaven.[2] The Father was always interested even in the trivial: "Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father: but the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows."[3]

The healing ministry of Jesus brought him into conflict

---

[1] Lk. 11:21, 22.

[2] Mt. 19:14. Also Mk. 10:14; Lk. 18:16. An added thought is found in Lk. 17:1, 2.

[3] Mt. 10:29-31. Cf. Lk. 12:6, 7.

with the Jews. They tried to restrain him, but secured the response, "How much then is a man of more value than a sheep! Wherefore it is lawful to do good on the sabbath day."[1] No legal technicalities could prevent the safeguarding of personality.

Jesus rebuked the vengeful attitude of his disciples. At an unpleasant encounter James and John said, "Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them? But he turned, and rebuked them."[2] The value of life was too great for such a treatment.[3]

Any attempted reconciliation of this spirit of human conservation with war, which destroys personality and life, can only result in a harsh distortion of the teachings of Jesus.

3. The application of the sixth commandment.

The problem of killing presented itself to Jesus on several occasions and he met it squarely. "Thou shalt not kill," was repeated time and again. Jesus used it in his reply to the rich young ruler.[4] Not content only with denouncing killing itself he went back of it to condemn the anger which prompts such activity. "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, that every one who is angry with his brother

---

[1]Mt. 12:12. [2]Lk. 9:54b, 55. [3]Note Lk. 8:26-33.
[4]Mt. 19:16-22; Mk. 10:17-22; Lk. 18:18-24.

shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; and whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire."[1]

Since even enemies were to be loved[2] and those who cursed[3] were to be blessed, and killing was forbidden, the whole field of human destruction was thus eliminated from Christian participation. There have, to be sure, been those who have attempted to make a distinction between killing as murder and killing as a part of warfare, but just how valid such a distinction is remains yet to be seen.

4. Illustrations used by Jesus which touch upon the military life of his day.

Illustrations are used to convey a meaning. The comprehension of the listener must be taken into consideration. The people of Jesus' day knew organized warfare and would understand quickly what was meant when illustrated thereby. So Jesus touched here and there upon armies, governors and kings. But it is no easy task to discover whether or not a sanction of war was intended.

In elucidating the kingdom of heaven Jesus referred to a king who made a marriage feast for his son and invited others to come. These refused to come, murdered the servants the king sent and went about their own good way. "But the king was wroth; and he sent his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned the city."[4]

---

[1]Mt. 5:21, 22. [2]Mt. 5:43; Lk. 6:27. [3]Lk. 6:28.
[4]Mt. 22:7.

In speaking of one's preparation to make the sacrifice of following him, Jesus referred to the activities of two kings. "Or what king, as he goeth to encounter another king in war, will not sit down first and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and asketh conditions of peace."[1]

In the story of the lord of the vineyard Jesus makes a reference to killing that seems to indicate a perfect right to take life.[2] And more than that, it is told to illustrate the reaction of God to a recalcitrant people.

5. Soldiers who came in touch with Jesus and were honored by him.

There is no incident in the gospels which might indicate that a soldier was less respected simply because he was a soldier. John the Baptist makes only a surface criticism when he teaches that the soldier should be satisfied with his wage, and should "extort from no man by violence."[3] Jesus suffered much hardship at the hands of soldiers, but he spoke no rebuke of them.[4]

There is one outstanding contact with a centurion. This man's servant, whom he valued highly, was at the point of death. He sent for Jesus that he might come and heal the servant. Jesus consented to go. "And when he was now not

---

[1]Lk. 14:31, 32. [2]Lk. 20:13-16. [3]Lk. 3:14b.

[4]Lk. 23:11; Jn. 19:1-3; Mk. 15:16-18; Mt. 27:27-31.

far from the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, Lord, trouble not thyself; for I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say the word, and my servant shall be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, having under myself soldiers: and I say to one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. And when Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned and said unto the multitude that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."[1]

But meeting a soldier as a man in need is far from indicating that Jesus would have spoken equally highly of the occupation in which the soldier was engaged. But that phase was not touched. All that can be concluded is that Jesus honored the man, and not necessarily his chosen task.

6. The relationship of the followers of Jesus to government.

It is not a rosy picture that Jesus paints in words of the relationship his followers would bear to government. But this teaching in most part has to do with future conditions. The Christian would not be favorably viewed by the authorities. In the midst of warfare the followers of Christ would be brought to trial. "For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there shall be earthquakes in

---

[1] Lk. 7:6b-9.

divers places; there shall be famines: these things are the beginning of travail. But take ye heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in synagogues shall ye be beaten; and before governors and kings shall ye stand for my sake, for a testimony unto them."[1] Jesus does not state that his followers will participate in the warfare of these troublous times. Else if they did what the others were doing, why the persecution? In some fashion Christians would be out of step with the worldly designs of kings.

There is a much quoted statement uttered by Jesus. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."[2] What belongs to Caesar? What belongs to God? It is necessary to recall that the Jews were exempt from military service.[3] Hence Jesus could not be removing all bars to active warfare. The point in question was the payment of taxes; Jesus consented to pay them. There is no method by which to probe the mind of Christ on the subject except by consulting the whole tenor and spirit of his life and teachings. These would indicate an entire rejection of force in the physical field.

7. Teachings from which certain inferences can be drawn.

There remains a group of teachings of Jesus which point toward certain definite human relationships. These have to do with forgiveness, neighborliness, and peacefulness.

---

[1] Mk. 13:8, 9. Cf. Lk. 21:10-17; Mt. 10:17, 18. In the account by Matthew the present time was more in mind.

[2] Mt. 22:21b; Mk. 12:17b; Lk. 20:25. [3] See page 4.

The Jews recognized the propriety of forgiving a brother seven times. This would seem to be very generous. But Jesus went far beyond this, for when Peter came "and said to him, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? until seven times?: Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven."[1] Until seventy times seven would indicate a never ending forgiveness. And such is identically the attitude of Jesus on the cross.[2] With such a spirit manifested among Christians there could never arise for them situations which would call for resistance, at least of such a nature as war demands.

Jesus placed considerable emphasis upon neighborliness. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as theyself"[3] came naturally to his lips. On one occasion when he referred to this thought a lawyer asked, Who is my neighbor? In reply Jesus told the story of the Good Samaritan.[4] The gist of the story is that need names a neighbor. It is only necessary to ask the question, "Can neighborliness be practiced in war?" to reveal the incongruity of sanctioning war.

As a love of peace Jesus is without a rival. The whole attitude of his life from the beginning of his ministry to its tragic end reveals his love for it. To his disciples he said, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you:

---

[1] Mt. 18:21, 22.

[2] Lk. 23:34a.

[3] Mt. 19:19b; 22:29b. Mk. 12:31a.

[4] Lk. 10:30-37.

not as the world giveth, give I unto you."[1] On his entry into Jerusalem he uttered the passion of his heart for peace. "And when he drew nigh, he saw the city and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground . . . because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."[2]

The evidence as a whole seems to point quite definitely to a rejection of all force which fails to safeguard personality, human kindness, and love for all. When war can be so fought that these will be untarnished, then the spirit of Christ may be said to sanction it. Until then it is only by bungling exegesis that the ethical teachings of Jesus can be turned to favor war.[3]

---

[1] Jn. 14:27a.

[2] Lk. 19:41-44a, c.

[3] Cf. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 55: "We get at last to closer grips with our subject when we come to that ethical teaching of Jesus, which according to any natural and straight-forward exegesis is obviously and flagrantly incompatible with intentional and organized bloodshed, and therefore with war. The repeated prohibition of homicide (reinforced by the prohibition of anger in thought and word), the prohibition of resistance to and retaliation upon a wrongdoer, and the command to the disciples to love their enemies, cannot without a lot of unnatural straining and forcing be harmonized with the work of a soldier."

## III. THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS TAUGHT BY THE APOSTLES

The Apostles found themselves in an environment not much different from the one in which Jesus labored. There were no particular military demands made upon them. Hence they made but little ado over the participation of Christians in the army; in fact, that question may not have concerned them directly at all.[1] So whatever the conclusions to which one is led, they must be based on the enunciation

---

[1] Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 116f: "In view of the scantiness of our data, we must speak with diffidence. But we can safely say that, to the vast bulk of Christians, it did not as yet present a problem at all. Jews and slaves were legally disqualified from serving in the imperial armies. The government could nearly always get as many soldiers as it needed by ordinary methods of enlistment, without making wide use of its power to compel the unwilling. Such forcible recruiting as did occur took place more and more among the least civilized populations of the Empire. Gentile free- and freed-men who were Christians would thus hardly ever be called upon to serve. The same general conditions would probably prevail among the Jews in Palestine living under the Herodian princes or their own native rulers. Even the presence of converted soldiers in the Church did not raise the issue; for, neither on the one hand would such men, being inured to their duties, be likely suddenly to find wrong what they had all their life been taught to regard as honourable; nor, on the other hand, would the Christian civilians, who welcomed them into fellowship, and who, living far away from the battlefield, could only too easily ignore the question at stake, be likely to reproach or condemn them or urge them to abandon their calling. At the same time, the very presence of such men in the Church tended unconsciously to prejudice Christian judgment in a certain direction, before ever the issue was definitely raised. This unguarded immaturity or reflection must not be lost sight of in studying the Christian attitude to war during these early decades."

of principles rather than on completely diveloped convictions.

Similiar divisions of the study to those used in discerning the attitude of Jesus are employed here, as well as somewhat persistently throughout the whole examination.

1. The reaction of the Apostles to the use of force and the sword.

On several occasions Jesus met circumstances which called forth a definite pronouncement concerning the use of force and the sword.[1] If the Apostles made parallel statements the materials we possess in the New Testament give small account of them. Paul speaks of the sword as being unable to separate Christians from the love of Christ;[2] and then adds, as if to indicate non-resistance, "Even as it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we were accounted as sheep for the slaughter."[3]

In no case is it recorded that the Apostles resorted to force and the sword. In physical ways they were apparently harmless. Their teachings and lives were characterized by non-resistance. But such a conclusion does not prove that war was condemned; it only indicates a trend and nothing particularly definite either way. Christians through the centuries before us have been noted for their gentleness and forbearance in civilian life but have become ferocious when participating in the armies of the so-called Christian nations.

---

[1] See p. 4-10. [2] Romans 8:35. [3] Ibid., 8:36.

The book of Revelation refers many times to what have been called Messianis wars[1] but the present study does not consider them as pertinent to the theme. That Christ in "the last days" might wage terrific war proves nothing in revealing the attitude of the Apostles toward war in the day in which they lived.

2. An emphasis upon the value of human life, either physical or spiritual.

One definite statement is made by Paul concerning the sacredness of the body: "Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, and such are ye."[2] No limitations are given to the remark to indicate that in warfare such an indictment would not hold. Since war has always destroyed the "temple of God," the spirit of the verses might signify that life is too sacred to be destroyed ruthlessly.

There is, of course, an undercurrent of respect for personality in most of the New Testament writings,[3] but these do not break out in as clear a vein as in the above.

3. The application of the sixth commandement.

In summing up the commandments in the thought, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," Paul enumerates the

---

[1] Rev. 2:23; 6:18; 14:16-20; 16:13f; 19:11-16, 21; 20:7-10.

[2] I Cor. 2:16, 17.

[3] Romans 13:8: Gal. 5:14; Eph. 4:25; I Peter 2:17.

prohibition of murder among several others.[1]

Apparently among the Apostles small occasion arose for applying the commandment not to kill.[2]

4. Illustrations used by the Apostles which touch upon the military life of their day.

Paul in particular delights to compare the spiritual conflict with earthly warfare. The atmosphere of the time was charged with the military spirit. Everywhere the Roman soldier was in evidence. The Jews, dominated as they were, had thoughts of a military conquest of Rome. It was only natural that the Apostles should seize upon the metaphor of a spiritual warfare and use earthly symbols for its description. In fact, every spiritual idea is expressed in temporal terms, since human speech is bound by them.

"Fight the good fight,"[3] "war the good warfare,"[4] "I have fought the good fight,"[5] come naturally to the lips of Paul. To Timothy he says, "Suffer hardship with me, as a good soldier of Christ Jesus. No soldier on service entangleth himself in the affairs of this life; that he may please him who enrolled him as a soldier."[6] Paul describes the armor of the Christian warrior.[7] It was, indeed, a militant church which the apostle to the Gentiles commended.

But Paul evidently realized the danger in these illustrations of suggesting more than he intended, for explana-

---

[1] Rom. 13:9. [2] James 2:11; I Pet. 4:15, indirectly.
[3] I Tim. 6:12a. [4] I Tim. 1:18d. [5] II Tim. 4:7a.
[6] II Tim. 2:3, 4. [7] I Thess. 5:8b; Eph. 6:11-17.

tions are given of his real meaning:[1] "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the spiritual places."[2] This statement clarifies the purpose for putting on the armor of God. "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh (for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds)."[3] This is a clear statement of Paul's type of conflict.

A direct reference is made by Paul to war: "For if the trumpet give an uncertain voice, who shall prepare himself for war?"[4] But here again it is not war that the writer intends to emphasize; rather is it the certainty of the sound. The apostle James also speaks of war when he asks, "Whence come wars and whence come fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your pleasures that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and covet, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war; ye have not, because ye ask amiss."[5] It is condemnation of war and fightings that he urges. From the text it would appear that Christians were participating in actual bloodshed.

To form any definite conclusions from the use of mili-

---

[1] This point is made by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 119.

[2] Eph. 6:12.

[3] II Cor. 10:3, 4.

[4] I Cor. 14:8.

[5] James 4:1-3a.

tary illustrations is a precarious task. There is no way to discover what approval or disapproval of war was intended. Of the use of military ideas Moffatt says: "These illustrations from St. Paul onwards merely indicate the martial environment of the new religion within the Roman world of the first three centuries; they no more prove that the church encouraged or even approved of war than the less frequent allusions to the games and the theatre prove that these were sanctioned by the conscience of the primitive Christians."[1]

5. The Apostles' contact with soldiers.

On the occasion of Peter's vision of the clean and unclean beasts there came to his door the servants of Cornelius, a centurion at the head of the Italian band.[2] In response to the invitation to accompany them Peter went with the servants to the household of the centurion and there preached Christ. As a consequence a group of Gentiles were baptized. But concerning the vocation of the centurion nothing is said, either for or against. Evidently the question was not raised, or, if raised, was not recorded.

At several places Paul came in touch with soldiers. In Jerusalem he was rescued from the violence of the Jews by Roman soldiers.[3] When shipwreck threatened him the soldiers planned to kill him, but were prevented by the centurion who

---

[1] Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, as quoted in footnote, by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 188.

[2] Acts 10.

[3] Acts 21:31-39; also 23:17-35.

desired to save him.[1] While in prison in Rome Paul was guarded by a soldier.[2]

No particular enmity is found between Paul and the soldiers or government officials.[3] He makes no reference to military employ as being out of harmony with a Christian profession. By this it is not necessarily meant that he approved of it, however. What is known is that Paul was friendly with those who were soldiers.

6. The relationship of the Apostles to government and authority.

It was only shortly after Pentecost that Peter and John were arrested by the Jewish authorities and taken to task for their preaching Christ.[4] The sentence passed upon them was that they could go free, only they must not continue to teach in the name of Jesus.[5] This Peter and John refused to do, saying, "Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard."[6] In this case there was no servile obeisance to authority. The same experience was enacted but a few days later with the

---

[1] Acts 27:42, 43.

[2] Acts 28:16.

[3] Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 114: "Friendly relations existed between Paul and certain government officials with whom he was brought into contact--the Asiarchs, the centurion who took him to Rome, and the Governor of Melita."

[4] Acts 4:1-3.

[5] Acts 4:18.

[6] Acts 4:19b, 20.

same demand and answer.[1]

That the Apostles had a wholesome respect for authority, however, is clearly indicated by that which befell Paul when on trial before the council of the Jews.[2] In response to Paul's statement concerning his life the high priest ordered him to be struck on the mouth. The apostle spoke defiantly in return, but when informed that it was the high priest who had spoken he said, "I knew not, brethren, that he was high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of a ruler of thy people."[3]

Paul's teachings on the subject of government and authority are always favorable to obedience to law. The thirteenth chapter of Romans is half given over to an exhortation to be subject to the higher powers, virtually stating that all rulers are directed by God.[4] In writing to Timothy[5] and Titus[6] he encourages obedience to rulers. A strict interpretation, however, of Paul's attitude and teaching is not consistent with his actions, for he endured imprisonment rather than obey the demand that he cease preaching Christ.[7]

---

[1] Acts 5:17-29. [2] Acts 23:1f. [3] Acts 23:5.

[4] Page, The Sword or the Cross, p. 34: "St. Paul upholds the state . . . Upon close inspection of the teaching of St. Paul, however, the most that can be said in this connection is the authority of the state is to be recognized and obeyed in so far as it does not conflict with the higher law of God."

[5] I Tim. 2:2. [6] Titus 3:1.

[7] Page, The Sword or the Cross, p. 35: "If St. Paul meant his words to be taken thus literally, he and the other disciples failed utterly to live up to their own teaching. The New Testament is filled with instances where the disciples were imprisoned for disobedience."

Peter wrote[1] in much the same vein as did Paul, but he, too, resisted the authorities, as the first part of this division illustrated.

7. Teachings from which certain inferences can be drawn.

A loving concern for others is found throughout the writings of the Apostles. The spirit of Jesus is quite apparent. Paul exhorts the Christians to "bless them that persecute you, and curse not;"[2] "Render to no man evil for evil. Take thought for things honorable in the sight of all men;"[3] "owe no man anything, save to love one another; for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law;"[4] "love worketh no ill to his neighbor: love therefore is the fulfilment of the law;"[5] "through love be servants one to another. For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;"[6] "walk in love."[7] John speaks out very clearly on the subject. "He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is no occasion for stumbling in him;"[8] "he that loveth not abideth in death. Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him."[9]

---

[1] I Pet. 2:13, 14, 17. [2] Rom. 12:14. [3] Rom. 12:17.
[4] Rom. 13:8. [5] Rom. 13:10. [6] Gal. 5:14.
[7] Eph. 5:2a. [8] I John 2:10. [9] I John 3:14b, 15.

The followers of Jesus laid great emphasis upon peace. Paul writes: "So then let us follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another;"[1] "put on therefore, as God's elect, holy and beloved, a heart of compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving each other, if any man have a complaint against any; even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye: and above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts."[2] In referring to the coming of Christ in the last days Peter exhorts: "Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for these things, give diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in his sight."[3]

Against one's enemies no physical violence is to be brought. "Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place unto the wrath of God: for it is written, vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord. But if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."[4] "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice."[5] This regard

---

[1] Rom. 14:19. Cf. 12:18. [2] Col. 3:12-15. [3] II Pet. 3:14.
[4] Rom. 12:19-21. [5] Eph. 4:31.

for enemies was a direct result of the teachings of Christ.[1]

So much for the teachings of the Apostles. Now the question arises, Did the immediate followers of Jesus reject the war system?

In rejecting violence it would appear that the Christians could not consistently approve war.[2] But there is little evidence to show that soldiers who were converted were asked to leave their occupation.[3] Paul wrote that the dictum to be followed in regard to vocation was to "let each man abide in that calling wherein he was called."[4] That idea seems to have held in practice, also, whether Paul intended it to be

---

[1] Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 103: "We have already seen how thoroughly the early Christian leaders had imbibed the Master's teaching enjoining love for enemies and friendship with sinner, and forbidding not only homicide and hatred, but even retaliation and physical resistance to wrongs. So far as we can make out, this teaching was understood in its simple and literal sense without any elaborate theoretical modifications, and on the whole consistently adhered to in practice."

[2] Ibid., p. 107: "Another implication of the Christians' disapproval of violence would be their abstention from all forms of government-service, both military and civil, in which they would have to act as its agents in punitive or coercive measures."

[3] Ibid., p. 119f.: "While we find much in the literature of the time which clearly implies the incompatibility of the Christian life and bloodshed in any form or in any cause, and while we have no record of any Christian of the time entering, either voluntarily or otherwise, upon military life after his conversion, we have no evidence to show that leading and representative Christians felt the incongruity so clearly as to suggest that a soldier, if he were converted, ought to leave the service." Cf. p. 115 also.

[4] I Cor. 3:20.

related to military affairs or not.[1]

In conclusion let it be noted that before the seige of Jerusalem the Christians departed from the city and settled in Pella in Peraea. "We are too much in the dark as to the details to be able to ascertain the motive that really prompted the step. How far was it due to a disapproval of the national policy of the Jews? . . . or how far, possibly, to a feeling that the use of the sword was forbidden them? None of these reasons can be either definitely affirmed or definitely denied. The last one suggested is by no means impossible. It is in keeping with what we know of the facts of the case. At all events, the flame of Jewish patriotism was extinct in the hearts of these Jerusalem-Christians."[2]

---

[1] Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 114: "While we read of no Christian of this period entering upon official or military life after his conversion, we find mention made of some already settled in such life being converted and (for all we are told to the contrary) remaining without reproach or compunction in their former stations. These are--the eunuch of the Queen of Ethiopia, the centurion Cornelius, Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus, the gaoler of Philippi, Dionysius the Areopagite of Athens . . . Cripus, the ruler of the synagogue at Corinth . . ."

[2] Ibid., p. 121f.

# IV. THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS PORTRAYED BY THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS AND OTHER WRITERS OF THE PERIOD, A. D. 70-200

The Apostolic Fathers and the other Christian writers of the period A. D. 70-200 rejected for themselves, in most part, the war system. Peace they held to be the natural condition among men. Christianity had ushered in a new day in which peace as contrasted with war was to reign. But while peace was thus emphasized there was no unqualified condemnation of war.[1]

Some slight changes are now necessary in the divisions to be used in this study. The reaction to the use of force is more in the nature of non-resistance. The emphasis upon the value of human life is not now of the same striking character as it was with Jesus and the Apostles. So the divisions are as follows: 1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force; 2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment; 3. The relation of the Christians to government; 4. Love for one's enemies; 5. Peace pro-

---

[1] Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 184: "While thus in general terms peace was praised and strife and contention deprecated as unchristian, and while also much in a practical way was done by Christians in cultivating habits of peace both among themselves and also in their relations with the world outside, yet the Christian mind stopped short of pronouncing an unqualified condemnation of war. The verdict of disapproval was subject to limitation in three directions." These three directions are given in the pages following 184 as the Wars of Hebrew History, the Messianic Wars, and War as an Illustration of Christian Life.

claimed as the divine order of the universe; 6. Illustrations used by the Fathers and others which touch upon military life; 7. References which bear directly upon the war system.

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force.

The example of non-resistance on the part of Jesus was not lost upon the Christian writers now being considered. They too seemed to appreciate the instruction to be "harmless as doves." Whereas others retaliated and sought revenge, the Christian kept himself from strife.

In writing to the Philippians Polycarp quotes Scripture to indicate how non-resistant the Christian should be, "'not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing,' or blow for blow, or cursing, but being mindful of what the Lord said in His teaching: 'judge not, that ye be not judged...'"[1]

Although in conditional terms, Irenaeus speaks of those who have been influenced by the Lord's teaching to the extent of being non-resistant. "But if the law of liberty. . . . . caused such a change . . . that they are now unaccustomed to fighting, but when smitten, offer also the other cheek, then the prophets have not spoken these things of any other person, but of Him who effected them."[2]

It is also from the writings of Athenagoras (c. 177 A.D.)

---

[1] "The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians," Chapter II. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 33.

[2] "Against Heresies," Chapter XXXIV, 4. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 512.

that we obtain testimony as to the reaction of the Christians. He declares in regard to insults and damage: "These we hold in contempt, though to the generality they appear matters of great importance; for we have learned, not only not to return blow for blow, nor to go to law with those who plunder and rob us, but to those who smite us on one side of the face to offer the other side also, and to those who take away our coat to give likewise our cloak."[1] In another place he writes: "Among us you will find uneducated persons and artisans, and old women, who . . . when struck, they do not strike again."[2] In a third place he says: "These adulterers and paederasts defame the eunuchs and the once married . . . so that not even the governors of the provinces sent by you suffice for the hearing of the complaints against those, to whom it even is not lawful, when they are struck, not to offer themselves for more blows, nor when defamed not to bless; for it is not enough to be just (and justice is to return like for like), but it is incumbent on us to be good and patient of evil."[3]

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment.

The idea of murder as related to war is not frequently expressed. Yet not all of the early Christians neglected referring to it. Justin in his "First Apology" writes: "we

---

[1] "A Plea for the Christians," Chapter XI. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 129.

[2] Ibid., Chapter XI. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 134.

[3] Ibid., Chapter XXXV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 147.

who formerly used to murder one another do not only now refrain from making war upon our enemies, but also, that we may not lie nor deceive our examiners, willingly die confessing Christ."[1]

The abhorrence with which the Christians regarded the taking of life is clearly put by Athenagoras. "For when they (the non-Christians) know that we cannot endure even to see a man put to death, though justly, who of them can accuse us of murder or cannibalism? Who does not reckon among the things of greatest interest the contests of gladiators and wild beasts, especially those which are given by you ? But we, deeming that to see a man put to death is much the same as killing him, have abjured such spectacles. How, then, when we do not even look on, lest we should contract guilt and pollution, can we put people to death? And when we say that those women who use drugs to bring on abortion commit murder, and will have to give an account to God, for the abortion, on what principle should we commit murder? For it does not belong to the same person to regard the very foetus in the womb as a created being, and therefore an object of God's care, and when it has passed into life, to kill it; and not to expose an infant, because those who expose them are chargeable with child-murder, and on the other hand, when it has been reared to destroy it. But we are in all things always alike and the same, submitting ourselves to

---

[1]Chapter XXXIX. In TANF, Vol. 1, p. 176.

reason, and not ruling over it."[1]

Barnabas likewise commands that child life be not destroyed: "Thou shalt not slay the child by procuring abortion; nor, again, shalt thou destroy it after it is born."[2]

3. The relation of the Christian to government.

From the very beginning Christianity had borne a relationship to government. Jesus had been willing to pay the tax money when it was demanded.[3] The Apostle Paul had urged that the Christians be obedient to the authorities as unto those given power by God.[4]

The opposite view of government was voiced by John in the Book of Revelation, wherein Rome is identified with Babylon. But this view was not accepted by all the Christians.

The Christians prayed for the government. They had a selfish reason for their prayers, but a reason nevertheless. In response to criticism Athenagoras states: "For who are more deserving to obtain the things they ask, than those who, like us, pray for your government, that you may, as is most equitable, receive the kingdom, son from father, and that your empire may receive increase and addition, all men becoming subject to your sway? And this also for our advantage,

---

[1] "A Plea for the Christians," Chapter XXXV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 147.

[2] "The Epistle of Barnabas," Chapter XIX. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 148.

[3] Matthew 17:24-27. [4] Romans 13:1-10.

that we may lead a peaceable and quiet life, and may ourselves readily perform all that is commanded us."[1]

Irenaeus was grateful for the part played by the government in maintaining peace. In writing about the Romans and other nations he says: "Yea, moreover, through their instrumentality the world is at peace, and we walk on the highways without fear, and sail where we will."[2] For that much, at least, the Christian was indebted to worldly powers.

Mindful of nations and their rulers Polycarp wrote: "Pray also for kings, and potentates, and princes, and for those that persecute and hate you, and for the enemies of the cross, that your fruit may be manifested to all, and that ye may be perfect in Him."[3]

4. Love for one's enemies.

In the above quotation prayer for the enemies of the cross was urged. In the midst of a description of the change in the life of one becoming a Christian, Justin makes a statement of fact regarding relationship to one's enemies: "We who hated and destroyed one another, and on account of their different manners would not live with men of different tribe, now, since the coming of Christ, live familiarly with them, and pray for our enemies, and endeavour to persuade those who

---

[1]"A Plea for the Christians," Chapter XXXVII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 148.

[2]"Against Heresies," Book IV, Chapter XXX, 3. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 503.

[3]"The Epistle of Polycarp," Chapter XII. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 36.

hate us unjustly to live conformably to the good precepts of Christ . . ."[1]

The commandment of the Lord to love one's enemies is remembered and quoted. "And that we should be kindly disposed, not only towards those of our own stock, as some suppose, Isaiah the prophet said: 'Say to those that hate you, and that cast you out, Ye are our brethren, that the name of the Lord may be glorified, and be apparent in their joy.' And the Gospel says: 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that despitefully use you. For if ye love them who love you, what reward have ye? This do also the robbers and publicans.'"[2]

To love truly one's enemies would necessitate the elimination of all strife, and especially that which would result in physical harm. Strife can hardly exist where love is. Hence such a system as war would be incompatible to the idealism expressed in Christ's command to love one's enemies. In harmony with such a conclusion are the words of Ignatius: "For since there is no strife raging among you which might distress you, ye are certainly living in accordance with God's will."[3]

It was for no idle purpose that love for one's enemies was urged--a change in the relationship was desired. The goal was the abolition of all enmity. "And of these sayings

---

[1] "First Apology," Chapter XIV. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 167.

[2] "Theophilus to Autolycus," Book III, Chapter XIV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 115.

[3] "Epistle to the Ephesians," Shorter Version, Chapter VIII. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 52.

and teachings is this: Bless them that curse you, and pray for your enemies, and fast for them that persecute you. For what thank is there, if ye love them that love you? Do not also the Gentiles do the same? But do ye love them that hate you; and ye shall not have an enemy."[1]

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe.

Strife is the opposite of peace. And strife was severely condemned by the writers of this period. It was to be altogether forsaken by the followers of Christ.[2]

Peace in the length and breadth of the universe was proclaimed as the plan of God. Clement of Rome writes at length on the subject of universal peace and harmony. He tells how God has established peace as the natural order. The fruitful earth, the sea, the seasons, the winds, the fountains, and the very smallest of living beings meet together in peace and concord.[3]

Before introducing the above discourse on peace in the universe Clement refers to characters of humility of earlier days. "Wherefore, having so many great and glorious examples set before us, let us turn again to the practice of peace which from the beginning was the mark set before us; and let us look stedfastly to the Father and Creator of the universe, and cleave to His mighty and surpassingly great gifts and

---

[1] "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," Chapter I. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 377.

[2] "First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians," Chapters IX and XXXV. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 7 and 14 respectively.

[3] Ibid., Chapter XX. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 10f.

benefactions of peace. Let us contemplate Him with our understanding, and look with the eyes of our soul to His long-suffering will. Let us reflect how free from wrath He is toward all His creation."[1]

Irenaeus writes that it was the work of the new covenant to bring back peace, being apparently of the opinion that the original order was that of peace: "From the Lord's advent, the new covenant which brings back peace, and the law which gives life, has gone forth over the whole earth . . ."[2]

The highest possible value was placed upon peace by Ignatius: "Nothing is more precious than peace, by which all war, both in heaven and earth, is brought to an end."[3]

Abstractions such as the above are of doubtful value save as they become the inspiration for a concrete development of them in the actual life of the Christian. This practical phase the early Christians did not neglect. In writing to the Emperor, Justin states: "More than all other men are we your helpers in promoting peace, seeing that we hold this view, that it is alike impossible for the wicked, the covetous, the conspirator, and for the virtuous, to escape the notice of God, and that each man goes to everlasting punishment or salvation according to the value of his

---

[1] "The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians," Chapter XIX. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 10.

[2] "Against Heresies," Book IV. Chapter XXXIV, 4. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 512.

[3] "Epistle to the Ephesians," Shorter Version, Chapter XIII. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 55.

actions."[1] Clement urges that the Christians strive to be peaceable: "Let us cleave, therefore, to those who cultivate peace with godliness, and not to those who hypocritically profess to desire it."[2] He also quotes from Psalm xxxiv. 11-17, one verse of which is: "Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it."[3]

Peacefulness was a mark of qualification for men in the ministry. "We are of opinion . . ," Clement remarks, "that those . . . who have blamelessly served the flock of Christ in a humble, peaceable, and disinterested spirit, and have for a long time possessed the good opinion of all, cannot be justly dismissed from the ministry."[4]

The choice of God falls upon those who love peace: "For the holy word saith, 'On whom shall I look, but on him that is meek and peaceable and that trembleth at My words?"[5] In the hearts of these God's spirit consents to dwell: "'The Lord dwells in men that love peace, because He loved peace; but from the contentious and the utterly wicked He is far distant.'"[6]

---

[1] "First Apology," Chapter XII. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 165.

[2] "The First Epistle to the Corinthians," Chapter XV. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 9.

[3] Ibid., Chapter XXII. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 11.

[4] Ibid., Chapter XLIV. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 17.

[5] Ibid., Chapter XIII. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 8.

[6] "The Pastor of Hermas," Book III. Similitude IX, Chapter XXXII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 54.

In "The Epistle of Barnabas" there is a direct command: "Thou shalt be meek: thou shalt be peaceable. Thou shalt tremble at the words which thou hearest . . ."[1]

There are some testimonies of love of peace which are of uncertain date. Since they can as well appear here as elsewhere they are now given.

In one of the "Early Liturgies" there is a prayer "for the peace of the whole world, and the unity of all the holy churches of God."[2] "The Letter of the Churches of Vienna and Lugdunum to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia" contains this reference to the saints of God: "'And departing victorious over all to God, having always loved peace, and having recommended peace to us, in peace they went to God, leaving no sorrow to their Mother, nor division and dissension to their brethren, but joy and peace, and concord and love.'"[3]

That peace was loved is clearly indicated by the foregoing quotations. And peace is the opposite of war. But whether or not a love of peace means a hatred of war and a refusal to participate in it is not quite so clear.

6. Illustrations used by the Fathers which touch upon military life.

---

[1] Chapter XIX. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 148.

[2] From Division XXII, entitled "The Deacon makes the Universal Litany." In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 541.

[3] Psued-Irenaeus. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 784.

There is a striking paucity in the use of military illustrations during the period now being studied.[1]

Ignatius employs military figures of speech in writing of the service of the Christian: "Please ye Him under whom ye fight, and from whom ye receive wages. Let none of you be found a deserter. Let your baptism endure as your arms; your faith as your helmet; your love as your spear; your patience as a complete panoply."[2]

To act like soldiers is the urgent petition of Clement. "Let us then, men and brethren, with all energy act the part of soldiers, in accordance with His holy commandments. Let us consider those who serve under our generals, with what order, obedience, and submissiveness they perform the things which are commanded them. All are not prefects, nor commanders of a thousand, nor of a hundred, nor of fifty, nor the like, but each one in his own rank performs the things commanded by the king and the generals."[3]

Justin refers to the loyalty of soldiers to their oath and compares the attitude of the Christians to it. "But if the soldiers enrolled by you, and who have taken the mili-

---

[1] Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 272: "References to warfare as a type or pattern of the Christian life are not abundant in the literature of this period . . The paucity of these passages rather indicates that the military analogy did not appeal very widely or strongly to the Christians of this period." This is stated specifically of the period A.D. 110-180, but applies equally well to the years just preceding and following.

[2] "Epistle to Polycarp," Chapter VI. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 95.

[3] "First Epistle to the Corinthians," Chapter XXXVII. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 15.

tary oath, prefer their allegiance to their own life, and parents, and country, and all kindred, though you can offer them nothing incorruptible, it were verily ridiculous if we, who earnestly long for incorruption, should not endure all things, in order to obtain what we desire from Him who is able to grant it."[1]

7. References which bear directly upon the war system.

There appears in this period a very interesting story dealing with Christians in the army of Marcus Aurelius.[2] There seems to have been a legion in the army composed largely, if not entirely, of Christians. During a crucial time of conflict when the Roman legions were in danger of being overcome the Christians prayed for rain. The prayer was answered and the Roman army was saved, while the enemy was discomfited.

Considerable testimony purports to prove the truth of the story. Some Christian writers mention it. The earliest witness is Claudius Apollinaris who states: "'The legion which had by its prayer caused the prodigy received from the emperor a title suitable to the occurrence, and was called in the Roman language the Thunder-hurling Legion.'"[3] Tertullian refers on two occasions to the incident.[4]

---

[1] "First Apology," Chapter XXXIX. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 176.

[2] Eusebius, Ecc. Hist., v. 5.

[3] Quoted "From an Unknown Book." In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 772.

[4] "Apology," Chapter V. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 22; "To Scapula," Chapter IV. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 107.

A letter, held usually to be a Christian forgery, from Marcus Aurelius to the Senate, describing the situation, is appended by Justin to his Apology. In it the emperor relates: "Having then examined my own position, and my host, with respect to the vast mass of barbarians and of the enemy, I quickly betook myself to prayer to the gods of my country. But being disregarded by them I summoned those who among us go by the name of Christians. And having made inquiry, I discovered a great number and vast host of them, and raged against them, which was by no means becoming; for afterwards I learned their power. Wherefore they began the battle, not by preparing weapons, nor arms, nor bugles; for such preparation is hateful to them, on account of the God they bear about in their conscience. Therefore it is probable that those whom we suppose to be atheists, have God as their ruling power entrenched in their conscience. For having cast themselves on the ground, they prayed not only for me, but also for the whole army as it stood, that they might be delivered from the present thirst and famine."[1]

This evidence is sufficient to prove that toward the close of the second century there were soldiers in the Roman army, who claimed to be Christians. But when they had been converted, whether before or after entering the army, is a matter only for conjecture. Hence there is no way of knowing whether Paul's dictum to remain in the work in which one

---

[1] "Epistle of Marcus Aurelius to the Senate, in Which He Testifies That the Christians Were the Cause of His Victory," appended by Justin to his "Apology." In TANF, Vol. I, p. 187.

was converted was the determining factor or whether the church sanctioned participation in the army. Since the church, however, continued to relate the story it might be concluded that participation in army life was permitted.

Clement quotes from Job concerning God's care: "'In famine He shall rescue thee from death, and in war He shall free thee from the power of the sword.'"[1] But if Clement meant to approve of Christians in war he contradicts himself elsewhere when he protests strife among brethren. To the Corinthians he observes: "Every kind of honour and happiness was bestowed upon you, and then was fulfilled that which is written, 'My beloved did eat and drink, and was enlarged and became fat, and kicked.' Hence flowed emulation and envy, strife and sedition, persecution and disorder, war and captivity . . . For this reason righteousness and peace are now far departed from you."[2] And again: "Why are there strifes, and tumults, and divisions, and schisms, and wars among you? Have we not . . . one God and one Christ? Is there not one spirit of grace poured out upon us? And have we not one calling in Christ? Why do we divide and tear to pieces the members of Christ, and raise up strife against our own body, and have reached such a height of madness as to forget that 'we are members one of another?'"[3] In both these statements

---

[1] Job 5:20. "First Epistle to the Corinthians," Chapter LVI. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 20.

[2] "First Epistle to the Corinthians," Chapter III. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 5f.

[3] Ibid., Chapter XLVI. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 17.

war is deprecated as contrary to the spirit of Christ.

In the longer version only of "The Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians" there is this advice given: "Let governors be obedient to Caesar; soldiers to those that command them; deacons to the presbyters . . . and the rest of the clergy, together with all the people, and the soldiers, and the governors, and Caesar . . . to the bishop; the bishop to Christ, even as Christ to the Father."[1] Whatever validity might be attached to this counsel is marred by the fact that the longer version may not be the original epistle. But taking the quotation at its face value it seems evident that the life of the soldier was not adverse to the writer. At least he does not claim it to be outside of allegiance to God.

In plain words Tatian makes his position clear when he writes: "I decline military command."[2] Irenaeus contends that war was put away by the Christians: "But if the law of liberty, that is, the word of God, preached by the apostles . . . throughout all the earth, caused such a change in the state of things, that these (nations) did form the swords and war-lances into ploughshares and changed them into pruning-hooks for reaping the corn . . . into instruments used for peaceful purposes, and that they are now unaccustomed to fighting . . ."[3] Athenagoras writes that he believed that

---

[1] Chapter IV. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 81f.

[2] "Address to the Greeks," Chapter XI. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 78.

[3] "Against Heresies," Book IV, Chapter XXXIV, 4. In TANF, Vol. I, p. 512.

those who have waged war cannot by the single act of death be sufficiently punished for their devastations.[1]

The causes underlying war were analyzed by some of these early Christian writers: "Hatred is evil, because it continually abideth with lying, speaking against the truth; and it maketh small things to be great, and giveth heed to darkness as to light, and calleth the sweet bitter, and teacheth slander, and war, and violence, and every excess of evil; and it filleth the heart with devilish poison."[2] "Do ye then also, my beloved children . . . remove from you the spirit of envy, for this maketh savage the soul and destroyeth the body; it turneth his purposes into anger and war, and stirreth up unto blood and leadeth the mind into frenzy."[3]

Two testimonies concerning the reaction to war during this period are worth quoting: "For not in arms do they make their boast, nor do they commit murders: because our Commander has no delight in abundance of strength, nor yet horsemen and their glorious array . . . Oh the blessedness of peace without war!"[4] "And on account of the teaching of

---

[1] "The Resurrection of the Dead," Chapter XIX. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 160.

[2] "The Testament of Gad Concerning Hatred," 5. From "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," IX. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 29. Cave dates the composition at 192 A.D.

[3] "The Testament of Simeon Concerning Envy," 4. From "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," II. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 11f. Cave dates the composition at 192 A.D.

[4] "Ambrose," and Ancient Syriac Document. Date uncertain. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 741.

Paul, many, despising military life, clung to God; so that even from the emperor's bed-chamber some came to him, and having become Christians, were no longer willing to return to the army or the palace."[1] The uncertainty of the date and historic accuracy of at least the second testimony makes it precarious to form definite conclusions. But a state of mind is portrayed which indicates how some Christians viewed the subject.

It is certain that the Christians despised war, and loved peace. In one of the "Early Liturgies" is found the following: "O Christ . . . grant that the priesthood with the government may have peace; cause wars to cease from the ends of the earth, and scatter the nations that delight in wars, that we may enjoy the blessing of living in tranquillity and peace, in all temperance and fear of God."[2]

The period under consideration thus reveals a degree of disagreement among Christian writers. Some who called themselves Christian were in the army. But no iron-clad agreement against war is found. The varying conscience may be said to have been the guide.

---

[1] "Acts of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul," Paragraph 21. The date may be before Origen. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 479.

[2] In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 565.

## V. THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS PRESENTED BY THIRD CENTURY WRITERS

The third century of the Christian era is remarkable because of the activities and writings of three great men; viz., Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 153-217; Tertullian of Carthage, A.D. 145-220; and Origen of Alexandria, A.D. 185-245.[1] The influence of these men was tremendous. Other writers and workers of the century were overshadowed by them, with the possible exception of Cyprian of Carthage, A.D. 200-258, who in a short time made a deep impression on the life of the church.

The divisions of study remain the same as for the previous period.

### A. The View of Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 153-217.

Once again there now appears an emphasis upon the value of human life. Clement protests the heathen teaching that certain impersonal things are sacred and man is not. "For think not that stones, and stocks, and birds, and serpents are sacred things, and men are not; but, on

---

[1] Dates indicated are those given in TANF. It will be noted that all three writers root back in the previous century. But their influence and writings are mainly in the third century and for that reason are treated as belonging exclusively to that period; viz., Clement's writings date from A.D. 193-217; Tertullian's from A.D. 192-220; and Origen's from A.D. 230-254. Rigid divisions of time are not necessary to the purpose of this thesis.

the contrary, regard men as truly sacred, and take beasts and stones for what they are."[1]

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force.

In the life of the Christian, or the Gnostic--as Clement refers to him--retaliation has no place. What belongs to this life is not to be retained, "'but to him that takes our cloak to give our coat,' not only that we may continue destitute of inordinate affection, but that we may not by retaliating make our persecutors savage against ourselves, and stir them up to blaspheme the name."[2]

In clarifying the sixth chapter of Paul's first Letter to the Corinthians, Clement states: "He does not merely instance the Gnostic as characterized by suffering wrong rather than do wrong; but he teaches that he is not mindful of injuries, and does not allow him even to pray against the man who has done him wrong."[3] From the tone of the passage it is clear that Clement holds this ideal of non-resistance to be binding upon himself and every other Christian.

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment.

---

[1] "Exhortation to the Heathen," Chapter X. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 201.

[2] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book IV, Chapter X. See also "Exhortation to the Heathen," Chapter X. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 423 and 202 respectively.

[3] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book VII, Chapter XIV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 549.

In the days of Clement human sacrifice was offered by the Romans to their gods. The Christian writer, however, calls the sacrifice by another name. "For a murder does not become a sacrifice by being committed in a particular spot. You are not to call it a sacred sacrifice, if one slays a man either at the altar or on the highway to Artemis or Zeus, any more than if he slew him for anger or covetousness,--other demons very like the former; but a sacrifice of this kind is murder and human butchery."[1] These are plain words; would Clement speak as clearly concerning the sacrifice of men in the name of the god of war?

The Gnostic, according to Clement, read deeper than the letter of the law. The spirit of the law was the important thing. "So shall the Gnostic taste of the will of God. For it is not his ears, but his soul, that he yields up to the things signified by what is spoken. Accordingly, apprehending essences and things through words, he brings his soul, as is fit, to what is essential; apprehending (e.g.) in the peculiar way in which they are spoken to the Gnostic, the commands, 'Do not commit adultery,' 'Do not kill;' and not as they are understood by other people."[2] Does not the letter of the law indicate that some killing may not be murder? The spirit of the law is that no human life should be taken. "Let, then, the Athenian follow the laws of Solon,

---

[1] "Exhortation to the Heathen," Chapter III. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 183.

[2] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book VII, Chapter XI. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 540.

and the Argive those of Phoroneus, and the Spartan those of Lycurgus: but if thou enrol thyself as one of God's people, heaven is thy country, God thy lawgiver. And what are the laws? 'Thou shalt not kill . . ."[1]

3. The relation of the Christian to government.

A clear-cut, well-defined statement of Clement's position on the relation of the Christian to government cannot be found in his writings. Whereas in one place he will put the Christian above participation in worldly affiars, in another he plainly states that the affairs of the world are not forbidden.

Those statements which indicate a favorable attitude are several in number. To his readers Clement says: "It is in your power to listen to divine wisdom, ay, and to frame your life in accordance with it. Nay, you are not prohibited from conducting affairs in the world decorously according to God."[2] No distinctions are made here between kinds of "affairs;" hence the most likely inference is that matters of government are also included. This may become more evident when it is discovered that Clement offers special advices to judges, quoting: "'Thou shalt not show partiality in judgment. For gifts blind the eyes of those who see, and corrupt just words. Rescue the wronged.'"[3]

---

[1] "Exhortation to the Heathen," Clement of Alexandria, Chapter X. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 202.

[2] "The Instructor," Book III, Chapter XI. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 290.

[3] Ibid., Book III, Chapter XII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 293.

In referring to reverence Clement writes: "There is a two-fold species of fear, the one which is accompanied with reverence, such as citizens show towards good rulers, and we towards God, as also right-minded children towards their fathers."[1]

Clement, however, was not wholly convinced that the state was all that it ought to be, and he believed that in some phases at least the Christian was above it. He questions the value of the state to produce certain necessary ends: "For the laws of the state are perchance able to restrain bad actions; but persuasive words, which but touch the surface, cannot produce a scientific permanence of the truth."[2] For those who have the truth, it would then appear, the state with its legal requirements would be quite insufficient for righteous ends.

A clear statement of the Christian's relationship to the state is found in Clement's interpretation of the words of Jesus to the effect that whosoever shall leave father, or mother, or brethren for the sake of the Gospel and Christ's name will have certain rewards. He writes as follows: "'Mother' figuratively means country and sustenance; 'fathers' are the laws of civil polity: which must be contemned thankfully by the high-souled just man; for the sake of being the friend of God, and of obtaining the right hand in the holy

---

[1] "The Instructor," Book I, Chapter IX. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 231.

[2] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book VII, Chapter III. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 528.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

place, as the Apostles have done."[1]

No hard and fixed rule is set by this Christian writer. No pressure had been brought to bear as yet, apparently, to force him to be thoroughly consistent. But that Clement questions the sanctity of government and the place of its power over the Christian is quite certain.

4. Love for one's enemies.

The spirit of Christ is manifest in Clement of Alexandria. His vision carries him out to the bounds of the earth. In "The Instructor" he asks, "Are you amazed, then, to hear that men who belong to the nations are sons in the Lord's sight?"[2] Love is to determine the conduct, for "it teaches a natural communication, that what is found is to be regarded as a deposit, and that we are not to bear malice to an enemy. 'The command of the Lord being a fountain of life' truly, 'causeth to turn away from the snare of death.' And what? Does it not command us 'to love strangers not only as friends and relatives, but as ourselves, both in body and soul?' Nay more, it honoured the nations, and bears no grudge against those who have done ill. Accordingly it is expressly said, 'Thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian, for thou wast a sojourner in Egypt;' designating by the term Egyptian either one of that race, or any one in the world. And enemies, although drawn up before the walls attempting to take

---

[1] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book IV, Chapter IV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 412.

[2] Book I, Chapter V. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 212.

the city are not to be regarded as enemies till they are by the voice of the herald summoned to peace."[1] Words such as these need no interpretation. Even enemies were to be loved; all men were to be loved.

Of the Gnostic--or Christian--Clement writes: "Nor is he angry; for there is nothing to move him to anger, seeing he ever loves God, and is entirely turned towards Him alone, and therefore hates none of God's creatures."[2]

Clement refers directly to the command to love one's enemies. In the praise of virtues he says: "How great also is benignity! 'Love your enemies,' it is said, 'bless them who curse you, and pray for them who despitefully use you,' and the like; to which it is added, 'that ye may be the children of your Father who is in heaven,' in allusion to resemblance to God."[3] The Gnostic "knows that the Lord expressly enjoined 'to pray for enemies.'"[4] Hence the children of the Father are to be like the Father.

In the essay on "Who Is the Rich Man That Shall be Saved?" Clement develops some complicated argument to prove a spiritual point; i.e., that while enemies are to be loved there is such a thing as hating one's father, or son, or

---

[1] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book II, Chapter XVIII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 367.

[2] Ibid., Book VI, Chapter IX. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 496.

[3] Ibid., Book IV, Chapter XIV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 426.

[4] Ibid., Book VII, Chapter XIV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 548.

brother, when salvation is at stake.[1] The spiritual idea, however, is clear.

The purpose of love for one's enemies was not lost on Clement. It was not a merely idle statement that Christ made when he taught the disciples. Rather was there a dynamic of spiritual power. It was this that our Christian writer had in mind when he wrote: "An enemy must be aided, that he may not continue an enemy. For by help good feeling is compacted and enmity dissolved."[2] Clement looked for a day when all men would love one another.

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe.

While the second century writers spoke of peace in strong terms they did not always place it in opposition to war as the basis of comparison. But Clement usually refers to the subject in connection with the war system. He observes in agreement with Plato: "'Every legislator who is

---

[1] Paragraph XXII: "For the God of peace, who also exhorts to love enemies, does not introduce hatred and dissolution from those that are dearest. But if we are to love our enemies, it is in accordance with right reason that, ascending from them, we should love also those nearest in kindred. Or if we are to hate our blood-relations, deduction teaches us that much more are we to spurn from us our enemies. So that the reasonings would be shown to destroy one another. But they do not destroy each other, nor are they near doing so. For from the same feeling and disposition, and on the ground of the same rule, one loving his enemy may hate his father, inasmuch as he neither takes vengeance on an enemy, nor reverences a father more than Christ. For by the one word he extirpates hatred and injury, and by the other shamefacedness towards one's relations, if it is detrimental to salvation. If then one's father, or son, or brother, be godless, and become a hindrance to faith and an impediment to the higher life, let him not be friends or agree with him, but on account of the spiritual enmity, let him dissolve the fleshly relationship."

[2] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book IV, Chapter XIX. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 370.

even of slight use, will, in making his laws, have an eye to the greatest virtues. Such is fidelity' which we need at all times, both in peace and in war, and in all the rest of our life, for it appears to embrace the other virtues. 'But the best thing is neither war nor sedition, for the necessity of these is to be deprecated. But peace with one another and kindly feeling are what is best.' From these remarks the greatest prayer evidently is to have peace, according to Plato."[1]

Clement contrasts the habits of the Christian people with those of others. "The Scythians, the Celts, the Iberians, and the Thracians, all of them warlike, are greatly addicted to intoxication, and think that it is an honourable, happy pursiut to engage in. But we, the people of peace, feasting for lawful enjoyment, not to wantonness, drink sober cups of friendship, that our friendships may be shown in a way truly appropriate to the name."[2] Of another people he writes: "For we do not train our women like Amazons to manliness in war; since we wish the men even to be peaceable."[3] Of the Christians he observes: "It is not in war, but in peace, that we are trained."[4]

Peace in more general terms is spoken of by Clement.

---

[1] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book II, Chapter V. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 352.

[2] "The Instructor," Book II, Chapter II. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 245f.

[3] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book IV, Chapter VIII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 420.

[4] "The Instructor," Book I, Chapter XII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 234f.

"'Blessed, then, are the peacemakers,' who have subdued and tamed the law which wars against the disposition of the mind. . . . It follows that the perfect peacemaking is that which keeps unchanged in all circumstances what is peaceful . . . They also are peacemakers, who teach those who war against the stratagems of sin to have recourse to faith and peace."[1] It is also fitting of the Christian "who is at once a lover and disciple of the truth, to be pacific even in investigations . . ."[2]

6. Illustrations which touch upon military life.

The Christian life was often looked upon as a great struggle against the forces of evil. Such being the case military activity supplied an excellent analogy. So Clement found it a useful source of illustration.

To explain the purpose of chastisement in the life of the believer Clement describes the purpose and the method of punishment in the army: "Furthermore, the general of an army, by inflicting fines and corporeal punishments with chains and the extremest disgrace on offenders, and sometimes even by punishing individuals with death, aims at good, doing so for the admonition of the officers under him."[3] Chastisement is for the good of the Christian; hence it should be borne with fortitude.

---

[1] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book IV, Chapter VI. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 416.

[2] Ibid., Book VIII, Chapter I. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 558.

[3] "The Instructor," Book I, Chapter VIII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 225f.

Inevitably the Christian would come into conflict with others and suffer because of it. Clement attempts to comfort with these words: "And as those who maltreat property insult the owners, and those who maltreat soldiers insult the commander, so also the ill-usage of His consecrated ones is contempt for the Lord."[1] The burden is partly borne by the Lord.

The struggle to secure liberty in life must be carried to every phase of man's activity. "The struggle for freedom, then, is waged not alone by the athletes of battles in war, but also in banquets, and in bed, and in the tribunals, by those who are anointed by the word, who are ashamed to become the captives of pleasures."[2]

Considering the extent of Clement's writing his use of military illustrations is very meager. But where he was able therewith to clarify his teachings he did not hesitate to employ them. It must be kept in mind continually, however, that the use of army ideas would not necessitate the approval of the war spirit.

7. References which bear directly upon the war system.

In the discussion on Clement's view of peace practically every reference bears on the subject of war as the basis of comparison.[3] In clear statements the preference for peace

---

[1] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book IV, Chapter III. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 528.

[2] Ibid., Book VI, Chapter XIV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 506.

[3] See p. 55-57.

is established. But that Clement did not wholly reject the war system is indicated by the nature of the quotations which follow. It must be remembered, however, that the issue was not as clear-cut as it might be and that the pressure of the war system did not bear heavily enough to force a decision one way or the other.

Clement speaks of Moses as one "skilled in military tactics and strategy."[1] In the same connection he states: "Tactics belong to military command, and the ability to command an army is among the attributes of kingly rule."[2] In quoting Homer in the clause, "'For to one God has given warlike deeds,'" Scripture is added: "'But each has his own proper gift of God,'--one in one way, another in another."[3] If Clement means to say that God calls a man to be a soldier the natural conclusion is that being a soldier is proper and his work right. This may be Clement's meaning, for in another place we read: "Also to the soldiers, by John, He commands, 'to be content with their wages only;' . . ."[4] Even further can the argument be taken, for in the "Exhortation to the Heathen," Clement states his viewpoint: "Has knowledge taken hold of you while engaged in military service?

---

[1] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book I, Chapter XXIV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 336.

[2] Ibid., Book I, Chapter XXIV. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 336.

[3] Ibid., Book IV, Chapter XXI. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 434.

[4] "The Instructor," Book III, Chapter XII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 293.

Listen to the commander, who orders what is right."[1]

Did the Christians fight? It would seem so if we are to take this question literally: "Or must we forge Indian steel in order to divide meat, as when we call for a weapon for the fight?"[2]

Clement treats of military service with scarcely a trace of emotion. "Again, it is said, 'If any one who has newly built a house, and has not previously inhabited it; or cultivated a newly-planted vine, and not yet partaken of the fruit; or betrothed a virgin, and not yet married her;' --such the humane law orders to be relieved from military service: from military reasons in the first place, lest, bent on their desires, they turn out sluggish in war; for it is those who are untrammelled by passion that boldly encounter perils; and from motives of humanity, since, in view of the uncertainties of war, the law reckoned it not right that one should not enjoy his own labours . . ."[3] Although this quotation is taken from a discussion of the ethics of Moses, there is yet the suggestion of approval of the ideas considered. But against this must be set Clement's strong statement of the preparation of the Christian: "For it is not in war but in peace that we are trained."[4]

---

[1] Chapter X. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 200.

[2] "The Instructor," Book II, Chapter III. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 247.

[3] "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," Book II, Chapter XVIII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 365f.

[4] "The Instructor," Book I, Chapter XII. In TANF, Vol. II, p. 234f. Quoted also on page 56.

Summing up the attitude of Clement on war and related phases of it the following conclusions appear: (1) non-resistance is the ideal of Christianity, held by Clement to be binding upon himself as well as upon every other Christian; (2) the sixth commandment, "Do not kill," is to be interpreted by the Christian according to the spirit rather than just the letter of the law; (3) while Clement questions the sanctity of government and the place of its power over the Christian, he also at times indicates a favorable attitude toward it; (4) he lays emphasis on love for one's enemies even to the extent of aiding them; (5) peace is proclaimed as a desired virtue in which all Christians are to be trained, rather than in war; (6) meager use is made of military illustrations in depicting the nature of the Christian life; (7) the references to war show that while he emphasized peace as most desirable, Clement did not wholly reject the war system; either he gave partial assent to the existence of the war system or he was so far removed from a practical relationship to it that he felt no deep issues were involved.

B. The View of Tertullian of Carthage, A.D. 145-220.

The human body was considered of sufficient value by Tertullian to impel him to discourage the Christians from attendance at the racecourse. To the argument evidently offered by some, that Scripture mentioned the subject and hence approved of it he replied: "But if you argue that the racecourse is mentioned in Scripture, I grant it at once. But you will not refuse to admit that the things which are done there are not for you to look upon: the blows, and kicks, and all the recklessness of hand, and everything like that disfiguration of the human countenance, which is nothing less than the disfiguration of God's own image."[1]

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force.

Tertullian has little to say about the use of force, but enough to indicate the nature of his thought in the matter.

In the "Apology" there appears a discussion of the practice of virtues, in the midst of which Tertullian declares: "If the matter of sincerity is to be brought to trial, Aristotle basely thrust his friend Hermias from his place: the Christian does no harm even to his foe."[2] This view is put even more strongly in an earlier chapter where he states: "If injured, we are forbidden to retaliate, lest we become

---

[1]"The Shows, or De Spectaculis," Chapter XVIII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 87.

[2]Chapter XLVI. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 51.

as bad ourselves: who can suffer injury at our hands?"[1]

Tertullian contrasts the old and the new law: "For the wont of the old law was to avenge itself by the vengeance of the glaive, and pluck out 'eye for eye,' and to inflict retaliatory revenge for injury. But the new law's wont was to point to clemency, and to convert to tranquility the pristine ferocity of 'glaives' and 'lances' . . ."[2]

The quotations just given would seem to indicate that the Christian returned only good for evil. But Tertullian apparently forgot this idea for a moment, for in his attempt to point out the faults and flaws of the religion of Marcion he writes as follows: "Eye for eye does our God require; but your god does even a greater injury, (in your ideas), when he prevents an act of retaliation. For what man will not return a blow, without waiting to be struck a second time. Our God (you say) knows not whom He ought to choose."[3]

The contradiction contained in the last quotation is evident in comparison to the quotations preceding. The question arises, How could the same man see one matter in two such divergent light? One or the other view must be a mistaken one. Was it that Tertullian was so concerned about establishing the identity of the God of the Old Testament that he compromised for the moment his Christian convictions. Perhaps so; other men have done a similar thing in the heat of controversy.

---

[1] "Apology," Chapter XXXVII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 45.

[2] "An Answer to the Jews," Chapter III. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 154.

[3] "Against Marcion," Book II, Chapter XXVIII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 319f.

Viewing Tertullian's life and practice as a whole this conclusion would seem to be the natural one.

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment.

The testimony against killing is consistent throughout all the writings of Tertullian. Many times does he bring the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," to the attention of his readers.[1] To Marcion he addresses himself as follows: "Did Christ rescind the forementioned commandments: 'Do not kill' . . . or did He both keep them, and then add what was wanting to them?"[2] And again: "At any rate, my Creator did not learn from your God to issue such commandments as: Thou shalt not kill . . ."[3]

The excuse of idolatry as permission to sacrifice human values Tertullian will not tolerate. He speaks in plain words! "Set aside names, examine works, the idolater is likewise a murderer. Do you inquire whom he has slain? If it contributes aught to the aggravation of the indictment, no stranger nor personal enemy, but his own self . . . But if fraud, just as much as fornication and adultery, entails death, then, in these cases, equally with the former, idolatry stands unacquitted of the impeachment of murder."[4]

---

[1] "An Answer to the Jews," Chapter II. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 152. Also "On Modesty," Chapter V. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 78.

[2] "Against Marcion," Book IV, Chapter XXXVI. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 410.

[3] Ibid., Book II, Chapter XVII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 311.

[4] "On Idolatry," Chapter I. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 61.

In similar vein we read that wherever the business of the unclean spirit is, there are idolatries; wherever a man, by being polluted, is slain, there too is murder.[1]

In considering Acts xv. 28, 29, Tertullian writes: "Sufficient it is, that in this place withal there has been preserved to adultery and fornication the post of their own honour between idolatry and murder: for the interdict upon 'blood' we shall understand to be (an interdict) much more upon human blood."[2] In no case is man to be destroyed: "Why, all sorts of evils, which as indubitably evils even the heathens prohibit, and against the works of God. Take, for instance, murder, whether committed by iron, by poison, or by magical enchantments. Iron and herbs and demons are all equally creatures of God. Has the Creator, withal, provided these things for man's destruction? Nay, He puts His interdict on every sort of man-killing by that one summary precept, 'Thou shalt not kill.'"[3]

The sports of the Roman world came under Tertullian's disapproval. "So, too, the interdiction of murder shows me that a trainer of gladiators also is excluded from the Church; nor will any one fail to be the means of doing what

---

[1] "On Modesty," Chapter V. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 78.

[2] Ibid., Chapter XII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 85f.

[3] "The Shows, or De Spectaculis," Chapter II. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 80.

he subministers to another to do."[1]

Even the Romans testified to the nature of Christian teaching on killing, for Pliny informed the emperor that in the matter of Christian teaching murder was forbidden.[2]

Catching the spirit of Jesus Tertullian goes back of the deed to the real cause. "Man's wisdom to point out what is good, is no greater than his authority to exact the keeping of it; the one is as easily deceived as the other is despised. And so, which is the ampler rule, to say, 'Thou shalt not kill,' or to teach, 'Be not even angry?'"[3]

If Tertullian believed that killing in war was proper for the Christian he left no loop-hole for this idea in his consideration of the sixth commandment.

3. The relation of the Christian to government.

There is an element of the contradictory in the writings of Tertullian on the subject of the attitude of Christians toward government. The viewpoint of the moment seems to have influenced him. On one occasion he writes: "But why dwell longer on the reverence and sacred respect of Christians to the emperor, whom we cannot but look up to as called by our Lord to his office? So that on valid grounds," he claims, "I might say that Caesar is more ours than yours, for our God has appointed him."[4] But in another work he insists

---

[1] "On Idolatry," Chapter XI. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 67.

[2] "Apology," Chapter II. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 18.

[3] Ibid., Chapter XLV. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 50.

[4] Ibid., Chapter XXXIII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 43.

"that all the powers and dignities of this world are not only alien to, but enemies of, God; that through them punishments have been determined against God's servants . . ."[1] In the first instance Tertullian is addressing the emperor; in the second the people. Did these circumstances determine the nature of the statements? It would seem so.

To the emperors, however, were to be given honors to a certain degree. "Therefore, as to what relates to the honours due to kings or emperors, we have a prescript sufficient, that it behoves us to be in all obedience, according to the apostle's precept, 'subject to magistrates, and princes, and powers;' but within the limits of discipline, so long as we keep ourselves separate from idolatry."[2]

The emperor was continually remembered in prayer.[3] "Without ceasing, for all our emperors we offer prayer. We pray for life prolonged; for security to the empire; for protection to the imperial house; for brave armies, a faithful senate, a virtuous people, the world at rest, whatever, as man or Caesar, an emperor would wish."[4]

Unlike others the Christian never plotted against the state. "Aristippus in the purple, with all his great show of gravity, gives way to extravagance; and Hippias is put to death laying plots against the state: no Christian ever

---

[1] "On Idolatry," Chapter XVIII. In ANF, Vol. III, p. 73.

[2] Ibid., Chapter XV. In ANF, Vol. III, p. 71.

[3] "Apology," Chapter XXXIX. In ANF, Vol. III, p. 46.

[4] Ibid., Chapter XXX. In ANF, Vol. III, p. 42.

attempted such a thing in behalf of his brethren, even when persecution was scattering them abroad with every atrocity."[1]

The Christian, Tertullian maintains, alone was without crime.[2] There was, moreover, no inducement for the followers of Christ to take part in any public meetings, there being nothing "more entirely foreign to us than affairs of state."[3] Others did ask, nevertheless, if a Christian might not hold public office, and to these Tertullian replied that if sacrifice was not offered, nor oaths taken, nor anyone condemned nor tortured, then it might be possible.[4] But this is merely saying in a round-about fashion that it was not possible, these duties forming a natural part of the activities of the office. Yet Christians did partake in the affairs of state as revealed by Tertullian's own confession in his "Ad Nationes": "Day after day, indeed, you groan over the increasing number of Christians. Your constant cry is, that the state is beset (by us); that Christians are in your fields, in your camps, in your islands."[5]

In spite of all this, the Christians were considered quite other than friends of the state. Tertullian explains this situation by saying: "This is the reason, then, why

---

[1]"Apology," Chapter XLVI. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 51.

[2]Ibid., Chapter XLV. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 50.

[3]Ibid., Chapter XXXVIII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 45.

[4]"On Idolatry," Chapter XVII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 71f.

[5]Chapter I. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 109. See also, "Apology," Chapter XXXVII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 45.

Christians are counted public enemies: that they pay no vain, nor false, nor foolish honours to the emperor; that, as men believing in the true religion, they prefer to celebrate their festal days with a good conscience, instead of with the common wantonness."[1] These matters may have played some part in securing the antagonism of the people, but the real reason would seem to lie deeper; i. e., contempt for the gods which the Romans believed upheld them in power, and contempt for the state itself.

4. Love for one's enemies.

Tertullian displayed considerable concern for an enemy. In his "To Scapula," he declares: "We have sent, therefore, this tract to you in no alarm about ourselves, but in much concern for you and for all our enemies, to say nothing of our friends: For our religion commands us to love even our enemies . . . For all love those who love them; it is peculiar to Christians alone to love those that hate them."[2] In the "Apology" he asks this pertinent question: "If we are enjoined, then, to love our enemies . . . whom have we to hate?"[3] When writing "Against Marcion" Tertullian states that the Christian sheds perfect goodness voluntarily and freely upon strangers "on the principle that we are bidden to love even our enemies."[4] When others, Anaxagoras for

---

[1]"Apology," Chapter XXXV. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 43.

[2]Chapter I. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 105.

[3]"Apology," Chapter XXXVII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 45.

[4]Book I, Chapter XXIII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 288.

instance, "denied the deposit of his enemies," testimony is borne by our Christian writer that the Christian is noted for his fidelity even among those who are not of his religion.[1]

Scripture is quoted by Tertullian to maintain his stand. "'Love your enemies, and bless those which hate you, and pray for them which calumniate you.'"[2] It is Christ himself who says: "'Love your personal enemies, and blese your cursers . . . that ye may be sons of your heavenly Father.'"[3] Even when there exists a reason for hatred it is to be condemned: "God certainly forbids us to hate even with a reason for hating; for He commands us to love our enemies."[4]

Such was Tertullian's regard for his enemies. Fiery in disposition and unrestrained in action and speech as he frequently was, his life bore testimony to the practical realization of the spiritual values of his convictions.

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe.

The subject of peace does not have as rich a treatment by Tertullian as by Clement and others. Whether this was due to the vigor with which he applied himself to the warfare of the spirit, or to small concern regarding the subject is uncertain. He does have in mind, however, that the reign of

---

[1] "Apology," Chapter XLVI. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 51.

[2] "Against Marcion," Book IV, Chapter XVI. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 370.

[3] "Of Patience," Chapter VI. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 711.

[4] "The Shows, or De Spectaculis," Chapter XV. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 86.

peace was part of the consequence of Christlike living.

When prayer was offered for the emperor and his ministers it was in connection with the desire "for the prevalence of peace."[1] When refuting Marcion Tertullian quotes that noble passage from Isaiah prophesying the beating of swords into plough-shares, and spears into pruning-hooks, and interprets this to mean that Christians "shall change into pursuits of moderation and peace the dispositions of injurious minds, and hostile tongues, and all kinds of evil, and blasphemy. 'Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,' shall not stir up discord. 'Neither shall they learn war any more,' that is, the provocation of hostilities; so that you here learn that Christ is promised not as powerful in war, but pursuing peace."[2] Considering the same text Tertullian writes in "An Answer to the Jews" that it is "the new law's wont . . . to remodel the pristine execution of 'war' upon the rivals and foes of the law into the pacific actions of 'ploughing' and 'tilling' the land."[3] In another connection Tertullian further says of Jesus: "Surely to Sion He brings good tidings, and to Jerusalem peace and all blessings."[4]

Against Marcion are hurled the words of the Apostle Paul

---

[1] "Apology," Chapter XXXIX. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 46.

[2] "Against Marcion," Book III, Chapter XXI. See also Book IV, Chapter I. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 339f; 346.

[3] "An Answer to the Jews," Chapter III. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 154.

[4] "Against Marcion," Book IV, Chapter XIII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 364.

found in Ephesians vi. 14-17, one verse of which declares that God's armor "'shoes us with the preparation of the gospel of peace, not of war.'"[1] The phrase "not of war" does not appear in the modern Bible; that Tertullian uses it would apparently indicate that he believed in the peaceful purpose of Christianity as set against the warlike purpose of the nations of the world. Then after quoting from Paul's epistle Tertullian swings into a complicated argument to prove that both Christ and His apostle wrote of war and arms in figurative language.[2]

6. Illustrations used which touch upon military life.

It was to a great warfare that the Christians were called in the service of their God. To secure the victory there was required the same willingness to suffer privation and hardship as was necessary in military conquests. This

---

[1] "Against Marcion," Book III, Chapter XIV. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 333.

[2] Ibid., Book III, Chapter XIV: "'Who bids us take . . . the sword of the Spirit, which . . . is the word of God.' This sword the Lord Himself came to send on earth, and not peace. If he is your Christ, then even he is a warrior. If he is not a warrior, and the sword he brandishes is an allegorical one, then the Creator's Christ in the psalm too may have been girded with a figurative sword of the Word, without any martial gear . . . Thus is the Creator's Christ mighty in spoils, not of Samaria alone, but of all nations. Acknowledge, then, that His spoils are figurative, since you have learned that His arms are allegorical. Since, therefore, both the Lord speaks and His apostle writes such things in a figurative style, we are not rash in using His interpretations, the records of which even our adversaries admit; and thus in so far will it be Isaiah's Christ who has come, in as far as He was not a warrior, because it is not of such a character that He is described by Isaiah." In TANF, Vol. III, p. 333.

Tertullian recognized, as had others before him. When prison doors opened upon the followers of Christ Tertullian urged upon the martyrs the utmost constancy. "Grant now, O blessed, that even to Christians the prison is unpleasant; yet we were called to the warfare of the living God in our very response to the sacramental words. Well, no soldier comes out of the campaign laden with luxuries, nor does he go to action from his comfortable chamber, but from the light and narrow tent, where every kind of hardness, roughness and unpleasantness must be put up with. Even in peace soldiers inure themselves to war by toils and inconveniences --marching in arms, running over the plain, working at the ditch, making the testudo, engaging in many arduous labours."[1]

Upon protesting the entrance of Christians into second marriages Tertullian waxes sarcastic: "Of course the houses of none but married men fare well! The families of celibates . . . the fortunes of military men . . . have gone to rack and ruin! For are not we, too, soldiers? Soldiers, indeed, subject to so great a General?"[2] On another occasion he declares: "Against traitors and public foes every man is a soldier."[3]

In persecution it was the common lot of the Christian to endure the penalties of his faith. Tertullian makes it appear that the experience was welcomed: "Well, it is quite

---

[1] "Ad Martyras," Chapter III. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 694.

[2] "On Exhortation to Chastity," Chapter XII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 56.

[3] "Apology," Chapter II. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 19.

true that it is our desire to suffer, but it is in the way that the soldier longs for war. No one indeed suffers willingly, since suffering necessarily implies fear and danger. Yet the man who objected to the conflict, both fights with all his strength, and when victorious, he rejoices in the battle, because he reaps from it glory and spoil."[1]

There were those, however, who believed that discretion was the better part of valor, and who fled the scenes of persecution. Such action did not receive the approval of Tertullian. "And when will he who, as a fugutive, is a defeated man, be conqueror? A worthy soldier he furnishes to his commander Christ, who, so amply armed by the apostle, as soon as he hears persecution's trumpet, runs off from the day of persecution."[2]

Was there not given to the Christian strength from heaven? To prove this Tertullian goes back to the period of the Old Testament: "At the very moment when Samuel was offering the holocaust (in no way do we learn that the clemency of God was more procured than by the abstinence of the people), and the aliens were advancing to battle, then and there 'the Lord thundered with a mighty voice upon the aliens, and they were thrown into confusion, and fell in a mass in the sight of Israel; and the men of Israel went forth out of Mizpeh, and smote them unto Bethor,'--the unfed (chasing) the fed, the

---

[1] "Apology," Chapter L. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 54.

[2] "De Fuga in Persecutione," Paragraph 10. In TANF, Vol. IV. p. 121.

unarmed the armed. Such will be the strength of them who 'fast to God.' For such, Heaven fights. You have (before you) a condition upon which (divine) defence will be granted, necessary even to spiritual wars."[1]

7. References which bear directly upon the war system.

It was inevitable that Tertullian should touch upon the war system. He lived in troublous times, both for the church and for the state. On many occasions it became an acute problem whether or not a Christian should be a participant in any of the activities of government, political or military. It is no wonder, therefore, that Tertullian makes frequent reference to war machinery.

Mention of the war system and the life of the soldier falls into two main divisions: statements which seem to indicate an approval of the system; and those which question seriously if a Christian has any right whatsoever to be a part of it. Consideration of the material will be taken in the order just given.

Tertullian is among those who mention the Melitene Legion in the army of the emperor. "So far from that, we, on the contrary, bring before you one who was their protector, as you will see by examining the letters of Marcus Aurelius, that most grave of emperors, in which he bears his testimony that that Germanic drought was removed by the rains obtained through the prayers of the Christians who chanced to be

---

[1] "On Fasting," Chapter VII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 106.

fighting under him."[1] Here Tertullian freely admits the presence of Christian soldiers in the army without questioning the ethics of the matter.

More direct witness to the presence of Christian soldiers in the war system is borne by Tertullian. "We sail with you, and fight with you, and till the ground with you; and in like manner we unite with you in your traffickings--even in the various arts we make public property of our works for your benefit."[2] Tertullian even noted that the Romans protested the number of Christians active in military life: "Your constant cry is, that the state is beset (by us); that Christians are in your fields, in your camps, in your islands."[3]

In comparing the sword of the brigand with the sword as the weapon of warfare, Tertullian writes: "The sword also which has received honourable stains in war, and has been thus engaged in a better manslaughter, will secure its own praise by consecration."[4]

Against Marcion Tertullian refers to the teachings of the apostle Paul regarding the right of a person to secure a living from his industry,[5] with the following interpretation: "When he (Paul) teaches that every man ought to live

---

[1] "Apology," Chapter V. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 22.

[2] Ibid., Chapter XLII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 49.

[3] "Ad Nationes," Chapter I. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 109. Quoted also on p. 68.

[4] "On the Resurrection of the Flesh," Chapter XVI. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 556.

[5] I Cor. ix.

of his own industry, he begins with a copius induction of examples--of soldiers, and shepherds, and husbandmen."[1] There is no implication here that the life of a soldier was considered incompatible with a Christian profession. It is possible, however, that neither Paul nor Tertullian was thinking of that phase of the question, and hence the quotation bears no testimony either way.

Is war held to be necessary in the economy of the universe? Tertullian writes in his "Treatise on the Soul" in this vein: "In very deed, pestilence, and famine, and wars, and earthquakes have to be regarded as a remedy for nations, as the means of pruning the luxuriance of the human race . ."[2] War here is conceded as a necessity. Did the writer also concede that it was right for the Christian to assist in the pruning process?

Against war is posited the following analysis: "For, if I am not mistaken, kingdoms and empires are acquired by wars, and are extended by victories. More than that, you cannot have wars and victories without the taking, and often the destruction of cities. That is a thing in which the gods have their share of calamity. Houses and temples suffer alike; there is indiscriminate slaughter of priests and citizens; the hand of rapine is laid equally upon sacred and on common treasure. Thus the sacrileges of the Romans are as

---

[1] "Against Marcion," Book V, Chapter VII. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 444.

[2] Chapter XXX. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 210.

numerous as their trophies."[1]

On another occasion Tertullian writes that Christ rides in His majesty "'because of truth, and meekness, and righteousness.' But who shall produce these results with the sword, and not their opposites rather--deceit, and harshness, and injury--which, it must be confessed, are the proper business of battles?"[2]

It is evident that Tertullian had a clear conception of the rapacity of war.[3] Knowing it he questioned the part a Christian might have in it. He faced the matter squarely in two of his books. In his "On Idolatry" he speaks of the relationship of the Christian to the war system. "But now inquiry is made about this point, whether a believer may turn himself unto military service, and whether the military may be admitted unto the faith, even the rank and file, or each inferior grade, to whom there is no necessity for taking part in sacrifices or capital punishments. There is no agreement between the divine and the human sacrament, the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the camp of light and the camp of darkness. One soul cannot be due to two masters--God and Caesar. And yet Moses carried a rod, and Aaron wore a buckle, and John (Baptist) is girt with leather, and Joshua the son of Nun leads a line of march; and the

---

[1] "Apology," Chapter XXV. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 40.

[2] "Against Marcion," Book III, Chapter XV. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 333.

[3] "On the Pallium," Chapter II: "Very great also has been the license of wars." In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 7.

People warred: if it pleases us to sport with the subject. But how will a Christian man war, nay, how will he serve even in peace, without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? For albeit soldiers had come unto John, and had received the formula of their rule; albeit, likewise, a centurion had believed; still the Lord afterward, in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier. No dress is lawful among us, if assigned to any unlawful action."[1] Such language is sufficiently clear in itself without further interpretation.

That the mere matter of dress should assume any great importance seems peculiar, but that it did is a matter of fact. Tertullian tells of a soldier in the camp who refused to wear the laurel-crown. "One of them, more a soldier of God, more stedfast than the rest of his brethren, who had imagined that they could serve two masters, his head alone uncovered, the useless crown in his hand--already even by that peculiarity known to every one as a Christian--was nobly conspicuous."[2] The soldier is condemned and thrown into prison.

In this story there is nothing said about the propriety of a Christian being a soldier. The only conclusion valid is that if a Christian is a soldier he should not wear the crown. A little further in the discussion Tertullian considers the whole question carefully: "To begin with the real ground of the military crown, I think we must first inquire

---

[1] Chapter XIX. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 73.

[2] "The Chaplet, or De Corona," Chapter I. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 93.

whether warfare is proper at all for Christians. What sense is there in discussing the merely accidental, when that on which it rests is to be condemned? Do we believe it lawful for a human oath to be superadded to one divine, for a man to come under promise to another master after Christ, and to abjure father, mother, and all nearest kinsfolk, whom even the law has commanded us to honour and love next to God Himself, to whom the gospel, too, holding them only of less account than Christ, has in like manner rendered honour? Shall it be held lawful to make an occupation of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who uses the sword shall perish by the sword? And shall the son of peace take part in the battle when it does not become him even to sue at law? And shall he apply the chain, and the prison, and the torture, and the punishment, who is not the avenger even of his own wrongs . . ? Then how many other offences there are involved in the performance of camp offices, which we must hold to involve a transgression of God's law, you may see by a slight survey. The very carrying of the name over from the camp of light to the camp of darkness is a violation of it. Of course, if faith comes later, and find any preoccupied with military service, their case is different, as in the instance of those whom John used to receive for baptism, and of those most faithful centurions, I mean the centurion whom Christ approves, and the centurion whom Peter instructs; yet, at the same time, when a man has become a believer, and faith has been sealed, there must be either an immediate abandonment of it, which

has been the course with many; or all sorts of quibbling will have to be resorted to in order to avoid offending God, and that is not allowed even outside of military service; or, last of all, for God the fate must be endured which a citizen-faith has been no less ready to accept. Neither does military service hold out escape from punishment of sins, or exemptionfrom martyrdom . . . For if one is pressed to the offering of sacrifice and the sheer denial of Christ by the necessity of torture or of punishment, yet discipline does not connive even at that necessity; because there is a higher necessity to dread denying and to undergo martyrdom, than to escape suffering, and to render the homage required . . . Touching this primary aspect of the question, as to the unlawfulness even of a military life itself, I shall not add more, that the secondary question may be restored to its place. Indeed, if, putting my strength to the question, I banish from us the military life, I should now to no purpose issue a challenge on the matter of the military crown. Suppose, then, that the military service is lawful, as far as the plea for the crown is concerned."[1]

The quotation has been given at considerable length because of the significance it bears to the problem of the Christian participation in the war system. It will be noticed that Tertullian is dubious as to whether a Christian may be a soldier at all and be loyal to Christ. He considers the matter from the angle of the battle itself as well as

---

[1]"The Chaplet, or De Corona," Chapter XI. In TANF, Vol. III, p. 99f.

from the peace-time compromises. Quite consistently he maintains that war is the opposite of the spiritual righteousness which Jesus came to establish. But seriously as he questions the matter even here he comes to no complete and decisive condemnation of war.

Tertullian's attitude toward these related phases of war and toward war itself may be summed up as follows: (1) retaliation is forbidden and the new law of clemency is established in Christianity, but in argument Tertullian sometimes fails to maintain an ideal stand; (2) not only murder itself is forbidden, but any pollution of man's mind by idolatries may be considered murder; (3) an element of the contradictory appears in the thought of government, for while the emperor is recognized as an instrument of God, and prayer for his welfare and the success of his armies is offered, yet all powers and dignities of this world are considered as enemies of God; (4) enemies are to be loved even when a valid reason for hating may be present; (5) the effect of Christianity is to change the warlike attitude of nations into one of moderation and peace; (6) every Christian is a soldier of the commander Christ, willing to endure hardship to retain his faith; (7) while Tertullian recognizes the fact that Christians are in the army, he very seriously questions whether warfare is at all proper for Christians, when the inevitable consequences of war are "deceit, harshness and injury," with the sacrifice of "truth, meekness and righteousness," which should be the goal of Christianity.

C. The View of Other Third Century Writers.

There are a number of Christian writers whose material has not as yet been touched. Among these the two most important are Origen and Cyprian. Origen, in his importance, compares favorably with Clement and Tertullian, but for convenience his contributions will be considered along with those of Cyprian and others, rather than as a separate study.

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force.

In writing against Celsus on the subject of the influence of the gospel, Origen mentions the necessity of war during the reign of Augustus in order to fuse into one the many populations of the earth; he also admits the need of the Peloponnessians and the Athenians of fighting in behalf of their native land, but these he mentions to form this conclusion: "How, then, was it possible for the Gospel doctrine of peace, which does not permit men to take vengeance even upon enemies, to prevail throughout the world, unless at the advent of Jesus a milder spirit had been everywhere introduced into the conduct of things?"[1] In the same work Origen states that it would have meant destruction to the Jews had the right of resisting their enemies been taken from them, but since "that same providence which of old gave the law, and has now given the Gospel of Jesus Christ, not wishing the Jewish state to continue longer, has destroyed their city and their temple; it has abolished the worship which was offered to God in

---

[1] "Against Celsus," Book II, Chapter XXXVI. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 444.

that temple . . . And as it has destroyed these things, in like manner it has extended day by day the Christian religion . . ."[1] Hence it is that Christians could not slay their enemies, or condemn to be burned or stoned those who had broken the law.[2]

Of James and other Christians in the flight to Jericho it is written: "'But our friends lifted him up, for they were both more numerous and more powerful than the others; but, from their fear of God, they rather suffered themselves to be killed by an inferior force, than they would kill others.'"[3]

In referring to martyrdoms Commodianus admonishes the Christians "not to desire other men's goods; to wish to have the benefit of martyrdom; to bridle the tongue, thou oughtest to make thyself humble; not willingly to use force, nor to return force used against thee, thou wilt be a patient mind, understand that thou art a martyr."[4]

Plainly, some of the Christians, at least, believed that resistance to force was not becoming to those who followed Jesus, the introducer of a "milder spirit." "Nor would the Christians . . . have adopted laws of so exceedingly mild a character as not to allow them, when it was

---

[1] Op. cit., Book VII, Chapter XXVI. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 621.

[2] Ibid., Book VII, Chapter XXVI. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 621.

[3] "Recognitions of Clement," Book I, Chapter LXXI. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 96.

[4] "The Instructions of Commodianus," XLVIII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 212.

their fate to be slain as sheep, on any occasion to resist their persecutors,"[1] had a rebellious spirit motivated them.

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment.

In the division just completed there is mention made of the fact that the Christians would not slay their enemies, and rather than kill others they would suffer death themselves.

Origen maintains that on no account might a Christian take human life. "If a revolt had led to the formation of the Christian commonwealth," he states, "the Christian Lawgiver would not have altogether forbidden the putting of men to death; and yet He nowhere teaches that it is right for His own disciples to offer violence to any, however wicked. For He did not deem it in keeping with such laws as His, which were derived from a divine source, to allow the killing of any individual whatever."[2] Another writer also condemns killing: "The whole earth shall be burnt up by reason of the deeds done in it, which men did corruptly . . . in murders, and in battles;"[3] "I made your hands that ye might stretch them forth in prayers, and supplications, and ye put them forth to robberies, and murders, and the killing of each other."[4]

---

[1] "Against Celsus," Book III, Chapter VII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 467.

[2] Ibid., Book III, Chapter VII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 467.

[3] "Appendix to the Works of Hippolytus," XXXVII. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 251.

[4] Ibid., XXXVII. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 251.

The murder of infants is forbidden. "Thou shall not slay thy child by causing abortion, nor kill that which is begotten; for 'everything that is shaped, and has received a soul from God, if it be slain, shall be avenged, as being unjustly destroyed.'"[1]

In one instance at least the cause of murder is touched upon and discouraged for the Christian. "'But let this be our study, that if those who err do not commit murder, we should not even be angry.'"[2]

Even to witness murder is forbidden: "To us it is not lawful either to see or to hear of homicide; and so much do we shrink from human blood, that we do not use the blood even of eatable animals in our food."[3]

There was, however, a distinction made by some between kinds of killing and the motives behind them. Dionysius interprets the phrase "there is a time to kill, and a time to heal," by saying, "to 'kill,' in the case of him who perpetrates unpardonable transgression; and to 'heal,' in the case of him who can show a wound that will bear remedy."[4] In the "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," the following inter-

---

[1] "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," III. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 466.

[2] "Recognitions of Clement," Book VI, Chapter XIII. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 156.

[3] "The Octavius of Minucius Felix," Chapter XXX. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 192.

[4] "Works of Dionysius,--Exegetical Fragments," I. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 114.

pretation is found: "'Thou shalt not kill;' that is, thou shalt not destroy a man like thyself: for thou dissolvest what was well made. Not as if all killing were wicked, but only that of the innocent: but the killing which is just is reserved to the magistrates alone."[1]

A divided opinion, of course, on the subject of killing would open up for the Christian of this early day a field of distinctions in which killing would be justified in some cases; viz., legal executions and killing in war; but condemned in others. Such being the case, no definite conclusions can be drawn from the period as a whole, although individual writers might have had fixed opinions on the subject.

3. The relation of the Christian to government.

The Romans protested the lack of cooperation on the part of the Christians with the affairs of the state. Chief among the critics of the Christians was Celsus whose text is no longer extant but whose ideas can be largely reproduced from the writings of Origen who attempted to answer all the cricitisms brought against the Christians. Celsus noticed that the followers of Christ did not assist the king nor fight for him; he urged them to do so. Origen quotes him and answers the accusations. "In the next place, Celsus urges us 'to help the king with all our might, and to labour with him in the maintenance of justice, to fight for him; and if he requires it, to fight under him, or lead an army with him.' To this our answer is, that we do, when

---

[1] Book VII, Section I, Paragraph II. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 466.

occasion requires, give help to kings, and that, so to say, a divine help, 'putting on the whole armour of God.' . . . The more any one excels in piety, the more effective help does he render to kings, even more than is given by soldiers, who go forth to fight and slay as many of the enemy as they can . . . And as we by our prayers vanquish all demons who stir up war, and lead to the violation of oaths, and disturb the peace, we in this way are much more helpful to the kings than those who go into the field to fight for them . . . And none fight better for the king than we do. We do not indeed fight under him, although he require it; but we fight on his behalf, forming a special army--an army of piety--by offering our prayers to God."[1]

In similar vein the "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles" bears witness to the type of activity the Christian carried on in behalf of the state. "We further pray to Thee, O Lord, 'for the king and all in authority,' for the whole army, that they may be peaceable towards us, that so, leading the whole time of our life in quietness and unanimity, we may glorify Thee through Jesus Christ, who is our hope."[2] "Keep the kings in peace, and the rulers in righteousness, the air in a good temperature, the fruits in fertility, the world in an all-powerful providence; pacify the warring nations, convert those that are gone astray . . ."[3]

---

[1] "Against Celsus," Book VIII, Chapter LXXIII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 667f.

[2] Book VIII, Section II, Paragraph XII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 489.

[3] Book VIII, Section III, Paragraph XV. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 491.

---

[1] "Against Celsus," Book VIII, Chapter LXVIII. In ANF, Vol. IV, p. 661.

[2] Book VIII, Section II, Paragraph VII. In ANF, Vol. VII, p. 629.

[3] Book VIII, Section III, Paragraph IV. In ANF, Vol. VII, p. 631.

The Christian apparently was not very active in the concerns of the state. He considered his contribution to be one of prayerful direction of government rather than active participation, where so much of compromise would be involved. This is not saying, however, that no Christian took part in the affairs of government, for that some did has already been indicated.[1]

4. Love for one's enemies.

In several instances the commandment of Christ to love one's enemies is quoted directly from the Scriptures.[2] One of these is found in the attempt of Cyprian to maintain the following thesis: "That even our enemies must be loved." And not only did Cyprian teach love for enemies, he exemplified it, as testified by Pontius the Deacon who wrote of him that he loved even his enemies.[3]

Again and again the Christian reader is reminded that the Lord commanded one to love his enemies. "For the Lord commanded us to love even our enemies, and by no means to

---

[1] See p. 68.

[2] "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," Book I, Section I, Paragraph II; in TANF, Vol. VII, p. 392. Origen, "Against Celsus," Book VIII, Chapter XXXV; in TANF, Vol. IV, p. 652. Cyprian, "Treatise XII. Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews. Third Book. Testimonies 49;" in TANF, Vol. V, p. 546. It is this last one that is referred to in the next sentence of main text.

[3] "The Life and Passion of Cyprian," 9. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 270.

hate our friends;"[1] "if they (worshippers of idols) love their neighbours, we should love even our enemies;"[2] "the Lord commands and admonishes us even to love our enemies."[3] "What beyond: . . . that you should love your enemies. . ?"[4]

It is a consistent note which the Christian writers strike on the idea of love for enemies. But it is not certain that opposing armies were considered enemies by even those who most strenuously urged that such be loved. The thought of personal enmity seems rather to be the undercurrent of the emphasis.

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe.

The Christians considered in this part of the study never hesitated to declare their faith in the peaceable purpose of their religion. On practically every occasion which permitted some reference was made to it. So truly did one Christian believe peace to be a part of his faith that he declared that the adversary in his first steps to seduce the elect tried to be pacific.[5]

Prayer for the continued peace of the world constantly ascended. "Let us pray for the peace and happy settlement

---

[1] "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," Book II, Section VI. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 419.

[2] "Recognitions of Clement," Book VI, Chapter XIII. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 156.

[3] Cyprian, "Treatise IV. On the Lord's Prayer," 17. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 452.

[4] Cyprian, "Treatise IX. On the Advantage of Patience," 16. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 488.

[5] "Appendix to the Works of Hippolytus," XXIII. In TANF, Vol. V. p. 248.

of the world, and of the holy churches; that the God of the whole world may afford us His everlasting peace, and such as may not be taken away from us . . ."[1] "Keep the kings in peace, . . pacify the warring nations."[2]

To those who were outside the fold the gospel of peace was presented. "'Why are you afraid of hearing frequently of peace? or do you not know that peace is the perfection of law? For wars and disputes spring from sin; and where there is no sin, there is peace of soul; but where there is peace, truth is found in disputations, righteousness in works.'"[3] Origen writes: "And to those who inquire of us whence we come, or who is our founder, we reply that we are come, agreeably to the counsels of Jesus, to 'cut down our hostile and insolent "wordy" swords into plough-shares, and to convert into pruning-hooks the spears formerly employed in war.' For we no longer take up 'sword against nation,' nor do we 'learn war any more,' having become children of peace, for the sake of Jesus, who is our leader . . ."[4]

In protesting the accusation by Celsus that Jesus was seditious Origen affirms: "Jesus is, then, not the leader of any seditious movement, but the promoter of peace. For

---

[1] "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," Book VIII, Section II, Paragraph X. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 485.

[2] Ibid., Book VIII, Section III, Paragraph XV. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 491.

[3] "Recognitions of Clement," Book II, Chapter XXXVI. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 107.

[4] "Against Celsus," Book V, Chapter XXXIII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 558.

He said to His disciples, 'Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you;' and as He knew that it would be men of the world, and not men of God, who would wage war against us, he added, 'Not as the world giveth peace, do I give peace unto you.'"[1]

The example for the Christian was Jesus Christ. "This Jesus, O ye bishops . . . you ought to imitate, in being meek, quiet, compassionate, merciful, peaceable . . . not soon angry . . ."[2] Cyprian writes: "Christ gave us peace; He bade us be in agreement, and of one mind."[3]

To the peaceful there was great reward. "For unity and peace and concord afford the greatest pleasure not only to men who believe and know the truth, but also to heavenly angels themselves . . ."[4] Cyprian testifies as follows: "The son of peace ought to seek peace and ensue it . . . Among His divine commands . . . the Lord . . . added this one, saying, 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you.' He gave this to us as a heritage; He promised all the gifts and rewards of which He spoke through the preservation of peace. If we are fellow-heirs with Christ, let us abide in the peace of Christ; if we are sons of God, we ought to

---

[1] "Against Celsus," Book VIII, Chapter XIV. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 644.

[2] "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," Book II, Section III, Paragraph XXIV. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 408.

[3] "Treatise I. On the Unity of the Church," 14. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 426.

[4] "Epistle LXXIV, Firmilian to Cyprian," 2; listed under "The Epistles of Cyprian." In TANF, Vol. V, p. 390.

---

[1] "Against Celsus," Book VIII, Chapter XIV. In ANF, Vol. IV, p. 644.

[2] "Considerations of the Holy Epistles," Book II, Section III, Paragraph XVIV. In ANF, Vol. VII, p. 408.

[3] "Treatise I. On the Unity of the Church," 14. In ANF, Vol. V, p. 426.

[4] "Epistle LXXIV, Pompilian to Cyprian," 2; listed under "The Epistles of Cyprian." In ANF, Vol. V, p. 390.

be peacemakers. 'Blessed,' says He, 'are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God.' It behoves the sons of God to be peacemakers, gentle in heart, agreeing in affection, faithfully linked to one another in the bonds of unanimity."[1] The spiritual consequences of peace is unity with the Lord: "Those who, proving vitorious in every struggle, and being made men of peace, have been the sons of peace, and the sons of God . . . have united themselves to the Lord, being made altogether spiritual, that they may be for ever one spirit with Him . . ."[2]

Cyprian further testifies that peacefulness is filling for all Christians.[3] In the "Clementine Homilies" it is written: "'But if one were universal superior, he, having no reason why he should make war, would have perpetual peace.'"[4]

Hence the reign of peace was highly exalted, both for the individual and the nation. The divine plan in the world was eternal peace.

6. Illustrations used which touch upon military life.

Among the Christian writers now being considered the use of military illustrations was quite popular. The nature

---

[1] "Treatise I, On the Unity of the Church," 24. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 429.

[2] Origen, "De Principiis," Chapter VIII, Section 4. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 266.

[3] "To Rogatianus the Presbyter," Epistle VI, 3. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 284.

[4] "The Clementine Homilies," Homily III, Chapter LXII. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 249.

of the Christian life, its aggressiveness, and its organization, all tended to make the analogy very fitting. No hesitation in the use of such illustrations is apparent.

The years that Cyprian was the bishop of Carthage were active ones. The Christians suffered persecution and martyrdom. A considerable part of Cyprian's writings concern themselves with encouraging those who bore the brunt of the severe trials. In his "Exhortation to Martyrdom" Cyprian exalts: "If to soldiers of this world it is glorious to return in triumph to their country when the foe is vanquished, how much more excellent and greater is the glory, when the devil is overcome, to return in triumph to paradise . . ; to accompany Him when He shall come to receive vengeance from His enemies, to stand at His side when He shall sit to judge."[1] In similar strain he writes: "Thus, whenever the soldier returns from the enemy laden with triumphant spoils, he rejoices in his wounds."[2] The Lord takes pride in His followers: "Thus the Lord rejoices in His soldier, Christ rejoices in the witness to His name."[3]

In spiritual warfare there was need of discipline. "Do you, however," Cyprian urged, "whom the celestial warfare enlisted in the spiritual camp, only observe a disci-

---

[1] "Treatise XI, Addressed to Fortunatus," 13. In TANF, Vol. V. p. 506.

[2] "On the Glory of Martyrdom," attributed to Cyprian. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 581.

[3] Ibid., 26. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 586.

pline uncorrupted and chastened in the virtues of religion."[1] In writing to those who have lapsed, encouragement is given: "Or if any one move Him still more by his own atonement, if he appease His anger . . . He gives arms again whereby the vanquished may be armed . . . The soldier will seek his contest anew; he will repeat the fight, he will provoke the enemy, and indeed by his very suffering he is made braver for the battle."[2]

He who fights for God is near earthly extinction. "For he who wars for God, dearest brethren," says Cyprian, "ought to acknowledge himself as one who, placed in the heavenly camp, already hopes for divine things . . ."[3] To Pompey he pleads: "Because we are God's faithful soldiers, who war for the faith and sincere religion of God, let us keep the camp entrusted to us by God with faithful valour."[4]

Spiritual warfare is compared to earthly warfare. "For the soldier does not arouse himself to arms before the enemy have brandished their hostile weapons . . ."[5] "Unless the battle has preceded, there cannot be a victory: when there shall have been, in the onset of battle, the victory, then

---

[1] "Epistle to Donatus," 15. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 279.

[2] "Treatise III, On the Lapsed," 36. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 447.

[3] "Treatise VII, On the Mortality," 2. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 469.

[4] "Epistle LXXIII, to Pompey," 9. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 389.

[5] "On the Glory of Martyrdom," 19; attributed to Cyprian. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 585.

also the crown is given to the victors. For the helmsman is recognised in the tempest; in the warfare the soldier is proved."[1] From Nemesianus Cyprian receives commendation: "And as a sounding trumpet, you have stirred up God's soldiers, furnished with heavenly arms, to the close encounter; and fighting in the first rank, you have slain the devil with a spiritual sword: you have also ordered the troops of the brethren, on the one hand and on the other, with your words, so that snares were on all sides laid for the enemy . . ."[2]

Origen's use of military illustrations is not as great as Cyprian's. Also Origen treats the subject matter in much cooler fashion. Interpreting Ephesians vi. 12 he writes: "We are not, however, to suppose that each individual has to contend against all these (adversaries). For it is impossible for any man, although he were a saint, to carry on a contest against all of them at the same time . . . But as, for example, if fifty soldiers were to say that they were about to engage fifty others, they would not be understood to mean that one of them had to contend against the whole fifty . . ."[3] To illustrate a certain point he weaves the following argument: "If we were to see some city surrounded by a severe blockade of the enemy, in which threatening engines were brought against the walls, and the place hard

---

[1] Cyprian, "Treatise VII, On the Mortality," 12. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 472.

[2] "Epistle LXXVII, Reply of Nemesianus . . to Cyprian," 2. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 405.

[3] "De Principiis," Book III, Chapter II, 5. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 332f.

---

[1] Cyprian, "Treatise VII, On the Mortality," 12. In ANF, Vol. V, p. 472.

[2] "Epistle LXXVII, Reply of Demetrianus . . to Cyprian," 5. In ANF, Vol. V, p. 409.

[3] "The Trinophis," Book III, Chapter II, 8. In ANF, Vol. IV, p. 338.

pressed by a vallum, and weapons, and fire, and all the instruments of war, by which destruction is prepared would we not rightly and deservedly say, if the enemy were repelled and put to flight, that the deliverance had been wrought for the liberated city by God? And yet we would not mean, by so speaking, that either the vigilance of the sentinels, or the alertness of the young men, or the protection of the guards, had been wanting."[1] There are those Christians whose work would keep them from worldly activities: "Those, however, especially belong to the sacred number, who are prepared to go forth to the battles of the Israelites, and are able to fight against those public and private enemies whom the Father subjects to the Son, who sits on His right hand that He may destroy all principality and power, and by means of these bands of His soldiery, who, being engaged in a warfare for God, do not entangle themselves in secular business . . ."[2]

In the "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," it is written that a soldier does not govern his king.[3] Julius Africanus claims that not as much can be achieved when a "king sends only his satraps to war, as when the king is there himself."[4] Dionysius writes that the stars have been

---

[1] Origen, "De Principiis," Book III, Chapter I, 18. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 321.

[2] Ibid., Book IV, Chapter I, 24. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 374.

[3] Book II, Section III, XIV. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 401.

[4] "The Extant Writings of Julius Africanus," II. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 130.

dealt with "as the general does who loves order and discipline, and who does not leave his army in an irregular condition, or suffer all things to go on confusedly, but marshals the calvary in their proper successions, and disposes the heavy-armed infantry in their due array, and the javelin men by themselves, and the archers separately, and the slingers in like manner . . ."[1] Archelaus insists that the brave king will march a great distance to meet his enemy rather than become paralyzed with fears of his own weakness.[2] Peter in the "Recognitions of Clement" argues in debate that should two king be prepared to do battle and the opportunity were given to choose the better king, without the necessity of bloodshed, he did not doubt but that his hearers would have sufficient insight to select the better of the two.[3]

Commodianus addresses himself to the soldiers of Christ: "When thou hast given thy name to the warfare, thou art held by a bridle. Therefore begin thou to put away thy former doings. Shun luxuries, since labour is threatening arms. With all thy virtue thou must obey the king's command, if thou wishest to attain the last times in gladness. He is a good soldier, always wait for things to be enjoyed . . . When thou seest the war, take the nearest contest. This is

---

[1]"Works of Dionysius.--Extant Fragments," Part I, II.--From the Books On Nature, III. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 87.

[2]"The Acts of the Disputation with the Heresiarch Manes," 25. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 198.

[3]Book II, Chapter XXIV. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 104.

dealt with "as the general does who loves order and discipline, and who does not leave his army in an irregular condition, or suffer all things to go on confusedly, but marshals the calvary in their proper successions, and disposes the heavy-armed infantry in their due array, and the javelin men by themselves, and the archers separately, and the slingers in like manner . . ."[1] Archelaus insists that the brave king will march a great distance to meet his enemy rather than become paralyzed with fears of his own weakness.[2] Later in the "Recognitions of Clement" argues in debate that should two king be prepared to do battle and the opportunity were given to choose the better king, without the necessity of bloodshed, he did not doubt but that his nearers would have sufficient insight to select the better of the two.[3]

Commodianus addresses himself to the soldiers of Christ: "When thou hast given thy name to the warfare, thou art held by a bridle. Therefore begin thou to put away thy former doings. Shun luxuries, since labour is threatening arms. With all thy virtue thou must obey the king's command, if thou wishest to attain the last times in gladness. He is a good soldier, always wait for things to be enjoyed . . . When thou seest the war, take the nearest contest. This is

---

[1] "Works of Dionysius.--Extant Fragments," Part I, II.--From the Books On Nature, III. In TANE, Vol. VI, p. 87.

[2] "The Acts of the Disputation with the Heresiarch Manes," 23. In TANE, Vol. VI, p. 198.

[3] Book II, Chapter XXIV. In TANE, Vol. VIII, p. 104.

the king's glory, to see the soldiery prepared."[1] Under the heading, "Who Have Apostatized From God," Commodianus maintains: "Moreover, when war is waged, or an enemy attacks, if one be able either to conquer or to be hidden, they are great trophies; but unhappy will he be who shall be taken by them. He loses country and king who has been unwilling to fight worthily for the truth, for his country, or for life. He ought to die rather than go under a barbarian king; and let him seek slavery who is willing to transfer himself to enemies without law."[2] Behind war is a designated cause: "Thou seekest to wage war, O fool, as if wars were at peace. From the first formed day in the end you fight. Lust precipitates you, there is war; fight with it. Luxury persuades, neglect it; thou hast overcome the war."[3] Destruction follows the departure from Christ: "Having become the soldiers of another than Christ, ye have perished."[4]

Probably no other activity among men served for comparison of the Christian life as well as that of military employ and activity. The analogy was widely used and was effective in a day when the Roman world was held intact and expanded by means of the militia. It cannot be concluded, however, that such use of illustration meant an approval of the war

---

[1] "The Instructions of Commodianus," LIII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 213.

[2] Ibid., L. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 213.

[3] Ibid., LXIII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 215.

[4] Ibid., LXVI. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 216.

system, for writers who used it in considerable measure questioned seriously whether Christians could be participants in actual warfare.

7. References which bear directly upon the war system.

This group of references falls into three natural divisions: a. The nature of war as viewed by these Christian writers; b. The causes of war; c. The problem of the Christian as a part of both the church and the war system. These will be considered in the order given.

a. The nature of war as viewed by these Christian writers.

In no case is war conceded to be a part of the Kingdom and therefore commendable in the social structure. Rather is it set up as an activity opposite to righteousness, and hence fruitful in evil. Cyprian, in writing to Donatus, says: "Consider the roads blocked up by robbers, the seas beset with pirates, wars scattered all over the earth with the bloody horror of camps. The whole world is wet with mutual blood; and murder, which in the case of an individual is admitted to be a crime, is called a virtue when it is committed wholesale. Impunity is claimed for the wicked deeds, not on the plea that they are guiltless, but because the cruelty is perpetuated on a grand scale."[1]

In the "Recognitions of Clement," it is contended that idolatry leads to all immorality, including wars: "'Hence

---

[1]"Epistle I, To Donatus." 6. In TANF, Vol. V, p. 277.

the madness of wars burst out; hence plunderings, rapines, captivities, and liberty reduced to slavery; each one, as he could, satisfied his lust and his covetousness, although no power can satisfy covetousness."[1] In the same work Peter answers his opponent in these words: "'Why are you afraid of hearing frequently of peace? or do you not know that peace is the perfection of law? For wars and disputes spring from sins; and where there is no sin, there is peace of soul . . ."[2]

Origen, in speaking of the Jews being permitted to bear army to slay their enemies, maintains that, for the Christian, Christ "nowhere teaches that it is right for His own disciples to offer violence to any, however wicked. For He did not deem it in keeping with such laws as His . . . to allow the killing of any individual whatever."[3]

b. The causes of war.

Various causes for war are mentioned. "The Clementine Homilies" suggest that the number of different governments form a basis for war: "Wars are constantly arising through there being now many kings all over the earth. For each one holds the government of another as a pretext for war. But if one were universal superior, he, having no reason why he should make war, would have perpetual peace."[4]

---

[1] Book IV. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 141.

[2] Book II, Chapter XXVI. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 107. Quoted also on p. 91.

[3] "Against Celsus," Book III, Chapter VII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 467. Quoted in part also on p. 85.

[4] Homily III, Chapter LXII. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 249. Quoted also on p. 93.

To Celsus who urges that the Christians should help the king with all their might, labor with him in the maintenance of justice, and fight for him, or under him, or lead an army along with him, Origen replies to this effect: "We do when occasion requires, give help to kings, and that, so to say, a divine help, 'putting on the whole armour of God.' . . . the more any one excels in piety, the more effective help does he render to kings, even more than is given by soldiers. . . . And as we by our prayers vanquish all demons who stir up war, and lead to the violation of oaths, and disturb the peace, we in this way are much more helpful to the kings than those who go into the field to fight for them. . ."[1] Origen also states that wars are caused by patriotic purposes, being carried on in behalf of the native country.[2]

c. The problem of the Christian as a part both of the church and the war system.

The problem of the Christian soldier had now become an acute one. In spite of the fact that several statements are made to the effect that war was no longer an active concern of the Christian, the Christian soldier was present to complicate the ideal teaching.

The passages which reject the war system are now presented. After referring to the wonderful "plough-share"

---

[1] "Against Celsus," Book VIII, Chapter LXXIII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 667f. Quoted also on p. 87f.

[2] Ibid., Book IV, Chapter LXXXIII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 534.

prophesy of Isaiah, Origen writes: "For we no longer take up 'sword against nation,' nor do we 'learn war any more,' having become children of peace, for the sake of Jesus, who is our leader . . ."[1] Archelaus testifies that when a group of soldiers were converted by a certain Christian's piety and munificence, "many of them were added to the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, and threw off the belt of military service, while others withdrew to their camp . . ."[2]

Before taking up the problem of regulating the soldier a few general statements should be quoted. Celsus wrote as if the Christian group refused to bear arms; to this idea Origen responds: "And if Celsus would have us to lead armies in defence of our country, let him know that we do this too, and that not for the purpose of being seen by men, or of vain-glory. For 'in secret,' and in our hearts, there are prayers which ascend as from priests in behalf of our fellow-citizens. And Christians are benefactors of their country more than others."[3] In the same work Origen writes: "But if all the Romans, according to the supposition of Celsus, embrace the Christian faith, they will, when they pray, overcome their enemies; or rather, they will not war at all . . ."[4] To answer the argument of Celsus that the bees wage war Origen says:

---

[1] "Against Celsus," Book V, Chapter XXXIII. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 558. Quoted also on p. 91.

[2] "The Acts of the Disputation with the Heresiarch Manes," 1. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 179.

[3] "Against Celsus," Book VIII, Chapter LXXIV. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 668.

[4] Ibid., Book VIII, Chapter LXX. In TANF, Vol. IV, p. 666.

"Perhaps also the so-called wars among the bees convey instruction as to the manner in which wars, if ever there arise a necessity for them, should be waged in a just and orderly way among men."[1]

The passages in the last paragraph have been give to reveal the non-Christian view of the refusal of the Christian to bear arms. But what did Origen have in mind when he said that prayers would ascend as from priests in behalf of their fellow-citizens? Did he intend a half-hearted approval of the war system for men in general but not for Christians? Or did he mean that even for the Romans the idea, "they will not war at all," was intended as a binding command? Finally, to wage war in a just and orderly fashion, "if ever there arise a necessity for them," may be the view that certain occasions would permit Christian participation, or simply a statement concerning the general worldly situation, apart from a Christian influence.

There is related in the "Works of Dionysius" an instance in which a Christian was a soldier, against which no protest is voiced. "And a certain soldier who stood by them (some Christians) when they were led away to execution, and who opposed the wanton insolence of the people, was pursued by the outcries they raised against him; and this most courageous soldier of God, Besas by name, was arranged; and after bearing himself most nobly in that mighty conflict on behalf of

---

[1] "Against Celsus," Book IV, Chapter LXXXII. In ANF, Vol. IV, p. 533.

piety, he was beheaded."[1] The point to be noted is that no question was raised as to the propriety of this Christian's being a soldier. Seeming to bear this out, the same "Works of Dionysius" relates that among the martyr friends in Christianity there were included "both soldiers and private citizens."[1]

There remain now for consideration a few of the regulations which were placed upon the Christian soldier. The very fact that these regulations exist is conclusive proof that there were Christian soldiers, some of whom were permitted to remain soldiers.

The "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles" rules as follows: "If a soldier come, let him be taught to 'do no injustice, to accuse no man falsely, and to be content with his allotted wages:' if he submit to those rules, let him be received; but if he refuse them, let him be rejected."[3] In case the opposite obtains then this is the rule: "Thou shalt refuse rogues . . , and a soldier who is a false accuser and not content with his wages, but does violence to the needy, a murderer . . ."[4]

The "Canons of the Church of Alexandria" contain two regulations of the Christian soldier: "Canon Thirteenth. Of a

---

[1]"Extant Fragments," Part II, Epistle III, 5. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 99. Also found in Eusebius, Ecc. Hist., VI, XLI.

[2]Ibid., Part II, Epistle I, 1. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 96.

[3]Book VIII, Section IV, XXXII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 495.

[4]Ibid., Book IV, Section II, VI. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 434.

prince or a soldier, that they be not received indiscriminately. Canon Fourteenth. That a Nazarene may not become a soldier unless by order."[1]

A distinction seems to have been made between the privileges of the ordinary Christian and an official in the church. The following quotation points in that direction: "Let a bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, who goes to the army, and desires to retain both the Roman government and the sacerdotal administration, be deprived. For "the things of Caesar belong to Caesar, and the things of God to God.'"[2] But even this deprivation was only in regard to the office and not to the profession of Christianity.

Briefly, the attitude of this group of writers on the phases considered may be concluded as follows: (1) Jesus had introduced a milder spirit among men resulting in a repudiation of the use of force, Christians permitting themselves rather to be killed than to kill others; (2) murder as well as the anger which might produce it is forbidden, it not being lawful for Christians so much as to see or hear of it, nor permit it with the unborn or the new-born infant; (3) prayer for those in authority is rather the task of the Christian than actual cooperation in governmental position; (4) enemies must be loved, for the Lord commanded it; (5) the peace which Jesus brought is God's everlasting peace, to be found ever among those who for the sake of Jesus have become the children

---

[1] Wrongly ascribed to Hippolytus. "Appendix to the Works of Hippolytus." In TANF, Vol. V, p. 257.

[2] "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, the Ecclesiastical Canons." In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 505.

prince or a soldier, that they be not received indiscriminately. Canon Fourteenth. That a Nazarene may not become a soldier unless by order."[1]

A distinction seems to have been made between the privileges of the ordinary Christian and an official in the church. The following quotation points in that direction: "Let a bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, who goes to the army, and desires to retain both the Roman government and the sacerdotal administration, be deprived. For "the things of Caesar belong to Caesar, and the things of God to God."[2] But even this deprivation was only in regard to the office and not to the profession of Christianity.

Briefly, the attitude of this group of writers on the phases considered may be concluded as follows: (1) Jesus had introduced a milder spirit among men resulting in a repudiation of the use of force, Christians permitting themselves rather to be killed than to kill others; (2) murder as well as the anger which might produce it is forbidden, it not being lawful for Christians so much as to see or hear of it, nor permit it with the unborn or the new-born infant; (3) prayer for those in authority is rather the task of the Christian than actual cooperation in governmental position; (4) enemies must be loved, for the Lord commanded it; (5) the peace which Jesus brought is God's everlasting peace, to be found ever among those who for the sake of Jesus have become the children

---

[1] Wrongly ascribed to Hippolytus. "Appendix to the Works of Hippolytus." In TANF, Vol. V, p. 257.

[2] "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, the Ecclesiastical Canons." In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 505.

of peace; (6) the military analogy is quite popular, the Christian being considered enlisted in the spiritual camp, enduring all harships and discipline like a faithful soldier; (7) war is declared the result of sin and always accompanied by bloody horror and the loss of liberty; it is caused by the multitude of different governments, by demons, and by patriotic ambitions; Christian soldiers were tolerated, but rules were passed regulating their conduct.

With this the study of the third century ends. In many instances the evidences have been conflicting. Against the Christian ideal of no participation in warfare there is placed the practical aspect of participation on the part of those believers who as yet had not gained the heights of idealism. There were for these, therefore, the statement of various regulations to hold them within certain bounds declared essential to the faith. Much as the church may have deprecated the worldly activity of its members there was not sufficient conviction to press an unqualified opinion one way or the other.

## VI. THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR AS EXISTENT JUST PRIOR TO THE ACCESSION OF CONSTANTINE, c. A.D. 306

The final division of the study has now been reached. The attitude of the Christians toward war has been traced from the day of the founder of the new faith to a time when the church has almost reached the threshold of a new outlook upon the relationship to the state.

The atmosphere among the Christians had changed considerably. At the time of Christ most of the converts were Jews, who were exempt from military service. The problem of participation in earthly warfare was not in the forefront. But the passing days brought the Gentiles into the folds of the church. Men raised in the military atmosphere of the Roman army became members. With each century the problem of Christian soldiers became more acute until regulations were made in order to control their conduct, as indicated by the previous division of study.

The Christians were now a mighty power in the Empire. No longer few in number they were looked upon by some of the Roman rulers as a menace to the state. To eliminate this menace terrible persecutions were inaugurated. Then, in the midst of severe trials for the Christians, a new figure appeared, Constantine. A new day dawned, into which this thesis will make no entrance.

1. The non-resistant character of the reaction to the use of force.

The Christian believed that the gospel had a quieting effect upon the passions of men, changing them from a vengeful group into a much more unrequiting one. Of this Arnobius says: "Although you allege that those wars which you speak of were excited through hatred of our religion, it would not be difficult to prove, that after the name of Christ was heard in the world, not only were they not increased, but they were even in great measure diminished by the restraining of furious passions. For since we, a numerous band of men as we are, have learned from His teaching and His laws that evil ought not to be requited with evil, that it is better to suffer wrong than to inflict it, that we should rather shed our own blood than stain our hands and our conscience with that of another, an ungrateful world is now for a long period enjoying a benefit from Christ . . ."[1] That this opinion held among a considerable group seems to be quite evident from the tone used by Arnobius, indicating that he was not speaking so much for himself alone but for many others.

Lactantius writes many times on the subject of non-resistance. Speaking of the Christian as a just man he says: "He must at all times and in all places guard innocence. And this precept is not limited to this, that he should not inflict injury, but that he should not avenge it when inflicted

---

[1]"Against the Heathen," Book I, 6. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 415.

on himself."[1] Concerning constancy he writes: "Constancy is a virtue; not that we resist those who injure us, for we must yield to these . . ."[2]

The holding of property has often been the source of much altercation. Being aware of this Lactantius speaks of it on several occasions, suggesting that the just man cares little for property. "But undoubtedly this is the cause why he appears to be foolish who prefers to be in want, or to die rather than to inflict injury or take away the property of another,--namely, because they think that man is destroyed by death."[3] "Since, therefore, he does injury to none, nor desires the property of others, and does not even defend his own if it is taken from him by violence, since he knows how even to bear with moderation an injury inflicted upon him, because he is endued with virtue; it is necessary that the just man should be subject to the unjust . . ."[4] A third quotation confirms the same idea: "But the just and wise man . . . neither desires anything which belongs to another, lest he should injure any one at all in violation of the law of humanity; nor does he long for any power or honour, that he may not do an injury to any one."[5] After considering the evil conse-

---

[1] "The Divine Institutes," Book VI, Chapter XVIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 183. Cf. "The Epitome of the Divine Institutes," Chapter LXV. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 250.

[2] Ibid., Book VI, Chapter XVII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 182.

[3] Ibid., Book V, Chapter XIX. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 154.

[4] Ibid., Book V, Chapter XXIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 160.

[5] Ibid., Book V, Chapter XXIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 159f.

quences of enlarging state boundaries by force, Lactantius exclaims: "For how can a man be just who injures, who hates, who despoils, who puts to death?"[1]

2. The application of the thought of the sixth commandment.

Lactantius makes much of the Christian's refusal to sanction the taking of human life. Referring to the sixth commandment he says: "For when God forbids us to kill, He not only prohibits us from open vilence . . . but He warns us against the commission of those things which are esteemed lawful among men. Thus . . . it makes no difference whether you put a man to death by word, or rather by the sword, since it is the act of putting to death itself which is prohibited. Therefore, with regard to this precept of God, there ought to be no exception at all; but that it is always unlawful to put to death a man . . ."[2] Not only is killing forbidden, but witnessing killing is to be avoided. "If, then, it is in no way permitted to commit homicide, it is not allowed us to be present at all, lest any bloodshed should overspread the conscience, since that blood is offered for the gratification of the people."[3] The Christian even in seeing the death of a man justly condemned "pollutes his conscience as much as if he should become a spectator and a sharer of a homicide which is

---

[1] "The Divine Institutes," Book VI, Chapter VI. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 169.

[2] Ibid., Book VI, Chapter XX. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 187.

[3] Ibid., Book VII, Chapter XX. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 187. Cf. also Book V, Chapter XVIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 153.

secretly committed."[1] So convinced is Lactantius that no life should be taken that he maintains: "I am not unwilling to confess he will rather die than put another to death."[2]

With Lactantius another Christian writer, Arnobius, writes in substantial agreement: "We should rather shed our own blood than stain our hands and our conscience with that of another."[3]

3. The relationship of the Christian to government.

Christian writers of this period were not in entire agreement concerning the place and purpose of the state, although the difference is not great, being chiefly in regard to the degree of allegiance the state should receive.

Several writers were convinced that God had used the state to secure certain good ends. Lactantius declares that God has raised up princes to rescind the impious and sanquinary edicts of the tyrants, thereby bringing forth peace.[4] Eusebius claims: "'God has placed the civil and social life of man in the midst of many;'" and also maintains that cities and states could not be completed without an order of government.[5] To such an idea Lactantius adds: "The bond of human society is by all means to be retained, because man can in no

---

[1] Op. cit., Book VI, Chapter XX. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 186.

[2] Ibid., Book V, Chapter XVIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 153.

[3] "Against the Heathen," Book I, 6. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 415.

[4] "Of the Manner in Which the Persecutors Died," Chapter I. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 301.

[5] Praeparatio Evangelica. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 543.

way live without man. But the preservation of society is a mutual sharing of kind offices; that is, the affording help that we may be able to receive it."[1] Although in sarcastic tone Arnobius refers to the princes as next to the gods, and most worthy of reverence.[2]

Eusebius testifies that the sovereigns found the Christians worthy to serve in high places. "These (the Christian), indeed, they (the sovereigns) eminently valued, and considered them as more acceptable than their associates in the imperial service."[3]

It was no servile attitude, however, that the Christians assumed. A power higher than that of the state was recognized. Lactantius commands: "'Let him who follows the Law of God not only obey the public laws, but let him be above all laws.'"[4] To live above all laws would be to live without flaw, an ideal not always easy of practice. But the attempt to live above all laws did not prevent the clash of purposes between the public laws and the law of God. Concerning this clash Lactantius says: "When men command us to act in opposition to the law of God, and in opposition to justice, we should be deterred by no threats or punishments from preferring the com-

---

[1] "The Divine Institutes," Book VI, Chapter X. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 174.

[2] "Against the Heathen," Book IV, 34. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 488 .

[3] Ecc. Hist., Book VIII, Chapter 1. Words in parenthesis mine.

[4] "The Divine Institutes," Book VI, Chapter XXIII. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 526. This part in TANF appears in Latin, and hence is quoted from Cadoux.

mand of God to the command of men."[1] This opposition became active in at least one instance which Lactantius relates. "Next day an edict was published, depriving the Christians of all honours and dignities; ordaining also that, without any distinction of rank or degree, they should be subjected to tortures . . . A certain person tore down this edict, and cut it in pieces, improperly indeed, but with high spirit, saying in scorn, 'These are the triumphs of Goths and Sarmatians.'"[2]

The practice of praying for the rulers of the land continued. When persecution against the Christians became active Arnobius protests. "For why, indeed, have our writings deserved to be given to the flames? our meetings to be cruelly broken up, in which prayer is made to the Supreme God, peace and pardon are asked for all in authority, for soldiers, kings friends, enemies . . ?"[3]

4. Love for one's enemies.

The quotation just given indicates that sufficient love existed for enemies that prayer in their behalf was offered. Lactantius offers the same sentiment. "For if we are created by one God, and descended from one man, and are thus connected by the law of consanquinity, we ought on this account to love every man . . . And on this account God commands us to pray

---

[1] "The Divine Institutes," Book VI, Chapter XVII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 182.

[2] "Of the Manner in Which the Persecutors Died," Chapter XIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 305f.

[3] "Against the Heathen," Book IV, 36. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 488.

always even for our enemies."[1]

Piety, Lactantius insists, is found among those "who maintain concord with all, who are friendly even to their enemies, who love all men as brethren, and who know how to restrain anger, and to soothe every passion of the mind with calm government."[2]

A Pseudo-Clementina writing of uncertain date bears witness of the Christian's love for others. "For this is comely before God and before men, that we should remember the poor, and be lovers of the brethren and of strangers, for the sake of God and for the sake of those who believe in God, as we have learnt from the law and from the prophets, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, concerning the love of the brotherhood and the love of strangers: for ye know the words which have been spoken concerning the love of the brotherhood and the love of strangers; powerfully are the words spoken to all those who do them."[3]

5. Peace proclaimed as the divine order of the universe.

Christ is portrayed by Methodius as "the Prince of Peace against him who stirs up wars; the Lover of mankind against the hater of mankind;"[4] "He will speak peace unto His people, and to His saints, and to those which turn their hearts unto

---

[1] "The Epitome of the Divine Institutes," Chapter LXV. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 250.

[2] "The Divine Institues," Book V, Chapter X. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 146.

[3] "The First Epistle of the Blessed Clement, the Disciple of Peter the Apostle," XII. In TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 60.

[4] "Oration on the Palms," VI. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 397.

Him."[1] And again: "From the time when Christ was incarnate, and armed and adorned His flesh with virginity, the savage tyrant who was master of incontinency was taken away, and peace and faith have dominion, men no longer turning so much as before to idolatry."[2]

Arnobius protests the idea that souls are born into this world only to become full of evil, when the Creator had brought them into existence for peace. "Was it for this that He sent souls, that, living till then in calm and undisturbed tranquillity, they might find in their bodies causes by which to become fierce and savage, cherish hatred and enmity . . . and finally, be put the one in the other's power, having changed the condition in which they were born?"[3] Men should listen to the voice of Christ. "But if all without exception who feel that they are men not in form of body but in power of reason, would lend an ear for a little to His salutary and peaceful rules, and would not, in the pride and arrogance of enlightenment, trust to their own senses rather than to His admonitions, the whole world, having turned the use of steel into more peaceful occupations, would now be living in the most placid tranquillity, and would unite in blessed harmony, maintaining inviolate the sanctity of treaties."[4]

---

[1] "Oration on the Palms," I. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 394.

[2] "The Banquet of the Ten Virgins," Discourse X, Chapter 1. In TANF, vol. VI, p. 348.

[3] "Against the Heathen," Book II, 39. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 449.

[4] Ibid., Book I, 6. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 415.

Of the just man Lactantius writes: "Or why should he carry on war, and mix himself with the passions of others, when his mind is engaged in perpetual peace with men?"[1] In further developing his theme he adds later that the just man--or the Christian--having no pride or insolence, does not raise himself too highly, but is calm and peaceful.[2]

6. Illustrations which touch upon military life.

Lactantius speaks of the universe as being ruled by one head and the affairs of nature arranged as in one army with many generals and other leaders for the equivalent number of legions, cohorts, divisions, which are drawn out in battle array and controlled in orderly fashion.[3] The Christian life itself is a great conflict, with activities very similar to earthly strife. "For as . . . when a contest with an enemy is set before you," Lactantius writes, "you must first labour that you may afterwards enjoy repose . . . for the enemy will surprise you offering no resistance . . . We must be on the watch, must post guards, must undertake military expeditions, must shed blood to the uttermost; in short, we must patiently submit to all things which are unpleasant and grievous . . . For God, who created men to this warfare, desired that they should stand prepared in battle array, and with minds keenly

---

[1] "The Divine Institutes," Book V, Chapter XVIII. In TANF, VII, p. 153.

[2] Ibid., Book V, Chapter XXIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 160.

[3] Ibid., Book I, Chapter III. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 12.

intent should watch against the stratagems of open attacks of our single enemy, who, as is the practice of skillful and experienced generals, endeavours to ensnare us by various arts, directing his rage according to the nature and disposition of each."[1]

The Arian heresy drew this statement from a Christian writer: "Else was it wont, as the king restores the ruined city, the general collects the dispersed army, the sailor repairs the broken ship, even so, I say, the soul used to minister supplies to the body before that the body was dissolved in the dust, being not as yet itself bound fast with fetters."[2]

The heathesn--as Arnobius refers to the non-Christians --brought against the Christians the charge of infidelity to the gods. This neglect of the gods, they said, had brought war, famine, and pestilence upon the earth. Arnobius protests the charge. Answering the heathen he writes: "You say that some of the (the gods) cause dissensions, that there are others who inflict pestilences, others who excite love and madness, others, even, who preside over wars, and are delighted by the shedding of blood; but we, indeed, on the contrary, judge that these things are remote from the disposition of the deities, or if there are any who inflict and bring these ills on miserable mortals, we maintain that they are far from the nature of the gods and should be

---

[1]"The Divine Institutes," Book VI, Chapter IV. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 166.

[2]Alexander of Alexandria, "Epistles on the Arian Heresy," I, 3. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 300.

spoken of under this name."[1] If it be true, however, that the gods control the activities of men, the gods and not the Christians are to blame. So Arnobius contends in the following statement: "My opponent says that Mars has power over wars; whether to quell those which are raging, or to revive them when interrupted, and kindle them in time of peace? For if he calms the madness of war, why do wars rage every day? but if he is their author, we shall then say that the god, to satisfy his own inclination, involves the whole world in strife . . ."[2]

"Do those to whom it has been so allotted, not exercise kingly power or military authority?" asks Arnobius. "Are men not every day advanced in posts of honour, in offices of power? . . . All other things with which the life of man is surrounded, in which it consists, do not all men in their own tribes practise, according to the established order of their country's manners? Since this is so, and since no strange influence has suddenly manifested itself to break the continuous course of events by interrupting their succession, what is the ground of the allegation, that a plague was brought upon the earth after the Christian religion came into the world?"[3] The Christian, therefore, is not responsible for the coming of wars.

---

[1] "Against the Heathen," Book VII, 36. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 532f.

[2] Ibid., Book III, 26. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 471.

[3] Ibid., Book I, 2, 3. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 414.

7. References which bear directly upon the war system.

The last phase of the original study is now before us. Various phases of human activity which are more or less directly related to the problem of war have been discussed. From the time of Jesus and his teachings the study has moved on until the last period before the harmonization of the purposes of church and state is reached. What now is the attitude of the Christians toward war and the war system? Has there been any change as the years have passed into centuries? That is now to be considered.

There are three angles along which the situation can be traced. They are as follows: a. The total lack of harmony between warfare and Christianity; b. The permissibility of warfare under certain conditions; and c. The participation in the war system and in warfare of Christian soldiers. In the order stated these will be briefly studied.

a. The total lack of harmony between warfare and Christianity.

Of the just man Lactantius remarks: "Thus it will be neither lawful for a just man to engage in warfare, since his warfare is justice itself, nor to accuse any one of a capital charge . . ."[1] Justice, a cardinal part of Christianity, is lost in war: "Justice itself is taken away, which is unable to bear the tearing asunder of the human race, and wherever arms have glittered, must be banished

---

[1] "The Divine Institutes," Book VI, Chapter XX. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 187.

and exterminated from thence . . ."[1] "Why should he (the just man)," asks Lactantius, "carry on war, and mix himself with the passions of others, when his mind is engaged in perpetual peace with men?"[2] Piety, he insists, is found truly "among those who are ignorant of wars . . ."[3] He is convinced that there would be no dissensions and wars "if God only were worshipped . . . since men would know that they are sons of one God; and, therefore, among those who were connected by the sacred and inviolable bond of divine relationship, there would be no plottings . . ."[4]

Lactantius casts ridicule at the procedure of immortalizing men: "If any one has slain a single man, he is regarded as contaminated and wicked, nor do they think it lawful for him to be admitted to this earthly abode of the gods. But he who has slaughtered countless thousands of men, has inundated plains with blood, and infected rivers, is not only admitted into the temple, but even into heaven."[5]

Wars are excited by the adversary: "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord . . . the Prince of Peace against him who stirs up wars . . ."[6]

---

[1] Op. cit., Book VI, Chapter VI. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 169.

[2] Ibid., Book V, Chapter XVIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 153.

[3] Ibid., Book V, Chapter X. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 145.

[4] Ibid., Book V, Chapter VIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 143.

[5] Ibid., Book I, Chapter XVIII. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 31.

[6] Methodius, "Oration on the Palms," VI. In TANF, Vol. VI. p. 397. Quoted in part on page 115.

b. The permissibility of warfare under cetain conditions.

Among the Christians there were found those who realized that the ideals of Christianity could not be attained by many who made a profession of being a follower of the Christ. Eusebius states this clearly when he writes of marriage and of the life of a soldier. Setting "'the perfect form of a Christian life'" on a plane above many a man he refers to an inferior standard, "'more human, such as condescends even to pure marriages . . . gives instructions to those who are rightfully serving as soldiers as to what is to be done . .'"[1] Apparently, in the mind of Eusebius, the ideal was for a Christian not to be a soldier, but, considering man's inability always to attain the heights, a lower level might still be acceptable.

The Christians protested certain wars which were fought against their wishes, but successful conclusions changed the reactions. This appears to be Arnobius' thought when he writes: "Sometimes, however, there were seasons of scarcity; yet they were relieved by times of plenty. Again, certain wars were carried on contrary to our wishes. But they were afterwards compensated by victories and successes . . ."[2] Does Arnobius mean by this that the wars were justified because the conclusions were satisfactory? It would seem so;

---

[1] Demonstratio Evangelica, I. viii. 30a. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 578.

[2] "Against the Heathen," Book I, 15, 16. In TANF, Vol. VI, p. 417.

---

[1] Tertullian, Exhortation to Chastity, i. viii. 306. Quoted by Jacoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 278.

[2] "Against the Heathen," Book I, 18, 18. In ANF, Vol. VI, p. 417.

and yet care must be taken not to conclude too much, for Arnobius does not say that these wars were fought by Christians, although they may have benefited by them.

c. The participation in the war system and in warfare of Christian soldiers.

During this period preceding the accession of Constantine there were Christian soldiers. Just how large their numbers were is uncertain, but there were enough of them to cause considerable anxiety to the Roman rulers.

Diocletian in particular was much disturbed by the presence of Christians. On one occasion with him Lactantius writes: "Diocletian . . . was a searcher into futurity . . . and while he sacrificed, some attendants of his, who were Christians, stood by, and they put the immortal sign on their foreheads. . . Then Diocletian . . . ordered not only all who were assisting at the holy ceremonies, but also all who resided within the palace, to sacrifice . . . And further, by letters to the commanding officers, he enjoined that all soldiers should be forced to the like impiety, under pain of being dismissed from the service."[1] But even Diocletian came to know the endurance of the Christians, for it fell to his lot to oppose the anger of Galerius who desired to destroy all the Christians. Concerning this Lactantius states: "The old man (Diocletian) long opposed the fury of Galerius, and showed how pernicious it would be to raise disturbances throughout the world and to shed so much blood; that the

---

[1] "Of the Manner in Which the Persecutors Died," X. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 304f.

Christians were wont with eagerness to meet death; and that it would be enough for him to exclude persons of that religion from the court and the army."[1]

Eusebius bears similar testimony. Writing of Diocletian during the nineteenth year of his reign he says: "He did not all at once, nor in a mass, wage an open war against us, but as yet only made trial of those that were in the armies, for in this way he supposed that the rest could easily be taken, if he first succeed in subduing these. Then one would see great numbers of the military, most cheerfully embracing a private life, so as not to renounce their reverence for the Supreme Creator of the universe."[2]

At least one Christian soldier had gained honor in his profession. "But Seleucus, one of the confessors of the army, brought the intelligence of his (Porphyry's) martyrdom to Pamphilus . . . He was of Cappadocia, but among the chosen band of Roman soldiers, of one who had obtained no small share of honours."[3]

From early times the Armenians defended themselves by means of arms, and resisted the approach of Maxaminus. "In addition to these calamities (famine and pestilence), the war with the Armenians threatened the tyrant. These men had been the friends and allies of the Romans from ancient times, and as they were Christians . . . he made them enemies instead of

---

[1] "Of the Manner in Which the Persecutors Died," XI. In TANF, Vol. VII, p. 305.

[2] Ecc. Hist., VIII, IV. Cf. Also VIII, I.

[3] Ibid., "Book of Martyrs," XI.

friends and belligerent foes instead of allies . . . He, therefore, together with his army, was defeated in the war with the Armenians."[1]

Not all the soldiers, however, who became Christians, could find it conscientiously possible to remain in the army. "Tarachus told the governor Maximus at Tarsus that he had been a soldier; 'but because I was a Christian, I have now chosen to be a civilian.'"[2] "Thus Marcellus' last words to his judge were: 'I threw down (my arms); for it was not seemly that a Christian man, who renders military service to the Lord Christ, should render it (also) by (inflicting) earthly injuries.'"[3] Maximilianus, a young Numidian Christian, who refused to accept the soldier's badge, saying repeatedly that he could not do so, because He was a Christian and served Christ,[4] is another of those who failed to reconcile with good conscience the trade of a soldier and the confession of Christ.

The evidence given is sufficient to indicate that Christians were in the army and participated in warfare without qualms of conscience in large part, and without feeling that the life of a soldier was entirely at odds with a Christian profession. The refusal to sacrifice to idols caused more to leave the army at this time than the conviction that soldiery

---

[1] Eusebius, Ecc. Hist., IX, VIII.

[2] Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 584. He quotes from Acta Marcellis 4 (Ruinart 344).

[3] Ibid., p. 584. Quotation from Acta Marcelli 4(Ruinart err).

[4] Ibid., p. 585. Quotation from Acta Maximilian 1, 2.

friends and belligerent foes instead of allies. . . . He, therefore, together with his army, was defeated in the war with the Armenians."[1]

Not all the soldiers, however, who became Christians, could find it conscientiously possible to remain in the army. "Tarachus told the governor Maximus at Tarsus that he had been a soldier; 'but because I was a Christian, I have now chosen to be a civilian.'"[2] "Thus Marcellus' last words to his judge were: 'I threw down (my arms); for it was not seemly that a Christian man, who renders military service to the Lord Christ, should render it (also) by (inflicting) earthly injuries.'"[3] Maximilianus, a young Numidian Christian, who refused to accept the soldier's badge, saying repeatedly that he could not do so, because He was a Christian and served Christ,[4] is another of those who failed to reconcile with good conscience the trade of a soldier and the confession of Christ.

The evidence given is sufficient to indicate that Christians were in the army and participated in warfare without qualms of conscience in large part, and without feeling that the life of a soldier was entirely at odds with a Christian profession. The refusal to sacrifice to idols caused more to leave the army at this time than the conviction that soldiery

---

[1] Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., IX, VIII.

[2] Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 584. He quotes from Acta Marcellis 4 (Ruinart 344).

[3] Ibid., p. 584. Quotation from Acta Marcelli 4(Ruinart eff).

[4] Ibid., p. 585. Quotation from Acta Maximilian 1, 2.

was un-christian.

This final division of the study of the early Christian attitude toward war may be summed up in its various phases in the following fashion: (1) injury is not to be done to another; it is more desirable to lose one's property and suffer wrong than to resist even those who injure one; (2) murder is forbidden, as is also the witnessing of bloodshed caused by another; (3) government is recognized as necessary among men as a bond of unity, but when the laws of man and God conflict the higher law of God is to be obeyed; (4) all men are to be loved as brethren, and prayer for one's enemies is a command of God; (5) since the coming of Christ peace has had dominion, the just man having no reason whatsoever to wage war when his mind is set upon perpetual peace; (6) the Christian is one who must continually be on guard lest the enemy overtake him; (7) out of the thought and experience of three centuries come three views of war: a. warfare is totally out of harmony with Christianity; b. warfare is permissible under certain conditions; c. Christians may participate in warfare under the ordinary conditions imposed by the world, provided there are no conscientious objections and the sacrifice to idols is not mandatory.

With Constantine a new day appears. His vision of the conquering cross led him to secure the cooperation of Christian soldiers. Upholding a Christian standard Constantine drew to his army many of the followers of Christ. The Nicean alignment of church and state changed in the large the outlook upon life.

## VII. THE GENERAL HISTORICAL REFERENCES AS GIVEN BY LATER HISTORIANS

Before coming to the final conclusion of this study it would seem interesting and profitable to consider the viewpoints of various historians on the question of Christian participation in the army of the Roman Empire during the ante-Nicean period. The observations of these historians will be given without enlargement and are intended merely to reveal the later interpretation which has been placed upon the attitude of the early Christians.

It is the opinion of Workman that the army never lacked Christians, true heroes of God, who were prepared, if need be, to lay down their lives rather than deny their Christ.[1] In writing of the army question he states: "Finally there was the question of the army, the symbol of patriotism . . . Should the Christian serve at all, or, if unable to escape this obligation, what was his duty? Opinion on the army varied considerably. Tertullian held that 'there could be no agreement between the human and divine sacramentum, the standard of Christ and the devil, the camp of light and the camp of darkness,' and went so far as to urge desertion. He was followed by Lactantius and Origen."[2] Workman concludes that Christians in the third century were to be met with

---

[1] Persecution in the Early Church, p. 187.

[2] Ibid., p. 181.

everywhere, in business, in all positions of the State, in the army, and even in the Senate."[1]

It is the opinion of Waddington that the spirit of the Roman emperors had something to do with the Christians entering the army. "Under such of the emperors as were not decidedly opposed to Christianity, a considerable number of its professors were to be found in the army and even at the court."[2]

Schaff's conclusion is as follows: "In regard to military and civil offices under the heathen government, opinion was divided. Some, on the authority of such passages as Matt. v. 39 and xxvi. 52, condemned all war as unchristian and immoral. Others appealed to the centurion of Capernaum and Cornelius of Caesarea, and held the military life consistent with a Christian profession. The tradition of the legio fulminatrix indicates that there were Christian soldiers in the Roman armies, and at the time of Diocletian the number of Christians at the court and in civil office was very considerable. But in general the Christians of those days . . . were averse to high office in a heathen state; and Tertullian expressly say, that nothing was more alien to them than politics."[3]

On military life Sheldon has this to contribute: "Civil and military duties were refused where they might have been

---

[1] *Persecution in the Early Church*, p. 189.

[2] *A History of the Church*, p. 51.

[3] *History of the Christian Church*, p. 314.

accepted. Yet it was not a principle with the Chruch at large to proscribe this public service; and we know as a matter of fact that there were Christians in the Roman army, and Christians at various times in the employment of the imperial court."[1]

Patterson, in his contributed article on the subject of war in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, writes: "(a) The literalist interpretation.--The view was widely prevalent in the early Church that was is an organized iniquity with which the Church and the followers of Christ have nothing to do . . . (b) The reasoned judgment of the Church.--The mind of the primitive Church, so far as reflected in the N. T., does not join in an unqualified condemnation of war. The Church of the apostolic age found solace in apocalyptic dreams which presupposed that the final redeemption of humanity would follow upon appalling conflicts between the powers of heaven and hell, of which the Christian saints, who would be collected in a camp, would at least be sympathetic spectators (Rev. $20^{9}$).

"During the four succeeding centuries, as has been exhaustively shown by Moffatt . . . the Church as a whole declined to be committed to the extreme position. From Tertullian himself we learn that there were numerous Christians in the Roman army by their own choice, and that the Church did not condemn them. Clement of Alexandria taught that the

---

[1] History of the Christian Church, p. 179.

[1]*History of the Christian Church*, p. 179.

position of a soldier was governed by the Pauline principle that a man should 'abide in that calling wherein he was called.' (Protrept. x. 100.) Diocletian found so many Christians in the army that he deemed it a danger to the State, and Constantine was impressed by their importance as a military asset less than as a political influence."[1]

It is the conviction of Jones that Christians were, indeed, to be found in the ranks of the army, but they were few in number, and held aloof from the practices of their fellow-soldiers.[2]

Neander testifies in the following vein: "There were, up to this time (c. 295) many Christians connected with the military service, both in the higher and lower ranks; and as yet had never been compelled to do anything contrary to their conscience." Maximilianus refused to become a soldier because he was a Christian. "Here, then, is good evidence, that the soldiers also could still openly profess Christianity, and that, if they only did their duty in other respects, they were not compelled to take any active part in the pagan ceremonies.

"Only a few years elapsed, however, after this occurrence . . . when the case was altered. Religious and political motives induced Galerius, in the first place, to remove from the army all that refused to sacrifice . . . Many gave in their commissions, and soldiers of all ranks, from the highest to the lowest, quitted the service, that they might re-

---

[1] Vol. XII, p. 678.

[2] The Roman Empire B. C. 29-A. D. 476, p. 337.

main stedfast to their faith."[1] But "respecting military service the opinions of Christians were divided,"[2] Neander adds.

Newman notes that Galerius resolved on the expulsion of Christians from the army. About 295 all the soldiers were ordered to sacrifice. Those that refused were expelled, and those that manifested zeal for Christianity were executed.[3] Of the same period de Pressense remarks: "Persecution commenced first in the camps. We have already pointed out how closely military service was associated with idolatrous practices. If the Christians were to be allowed to lead a peaceable life in the armies, it was necessary that their generals should voluntarily shut their eyes to many infractions of a discipline tainted with idolatry . . . It was the part of Galerius' design to awaken everywhere suspicion of the Christians."[4]

Ulhorn describes the change which took place in the Christian attitude toward war as the centuries passed. "How could the officer, or the soldier, perform his duties without denying his faith? For long the two callings were deemed incompatible, and the officer preferred to resign his position, the soldier to leave the ranks, rather than

---

[1] General History of the Christian Church, Vol. I, p. 146f.

[2] Memorials of Christian Life, p. 102.

[3] A Manual of Church History,

[4] "The Martyrs and Apologists," in The Early Years of Christianity, p. 204f.

to give up his Christian profession."[1] To this statement Ulhorn adds this footnote: "In general the Church had not prohibited military and political service."[2] But so many general contacts with the heathen as the Christian was inevitably to experience brought about a change. "In the long run it became impossible for the Christians to refuse military service and public office, and thus new ties were necessarily, though unwillingly, formed with the world."[3] In the period, therefore, of A.D. 250-300 "there were Christians everywhere, in town and country, among the rich and the poor, Christian officers in the army . . ."[4] "Diocletian . . . tolerated the Christians, not only in the army and in the administration, but was himself surrounded by Christians who filled high positions at the court."[5] In the end came persecution as "Galerius succeeded in carrying through the purification of the army as a preliminary measure. In A.D. 295 the order was given that all the soldiers should take part in the sacrifices. Many preferred to part with their military rank; men left the higher as well as the lower grades of the service, in order to remain faithful to their faith."[6]

Concerning the Christian attitude Baker says: "'It would seem that it is not till . . . the last forty years

---

[1] The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, p. 173.

[2] Ibid., p. 173, footnote.

[3] Ibid., p. 338f.

[4] Ibid., p. 380.

[5] Ibid., p. 403.

[6] Ibid., p. 405f.

of the third century, when the practical life and example of Christ and the Apostles was receding far into the background . . . that any active opposition to war in the abstract (apart from the pagan rites with which it was connected) is discernible in the practice of the Christians.'"[1] In referring to the refusal on the part of a soldier to wear the garland which others were wearing,[2] and of the subsequent condemnation of the soldier by his fellow Christians, Baker concludes that this account "is conclusive proof that the Christian society of the time (c. A.D. 211) found no cause of complaint in the fact of its members serving in the legions, and that they did not regard such service as incompatible with their religion.'"[3] Cunningham substantially agrees with Baker, when he says: "'There seems to have been an increasing aversion to military service on the part of the Christians in the third century.'"[4]

Of the period A.D. 250-313 Harnack writes: "'The number of Christian officers and soldiers in the army gradually increased . . . after the reign of Gallienus; so much so that the military authorities began to connive at Christianity;

---

[1] Influence of Christianity on war, p. 31f. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, footnote, p. 440.

[2] Recorded by Tertullian, De Corona, Chapter 1. See p. 79.

[3] Influence of Christianity on War, p. 25. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, footnote, p. 440.

[4] Christianity and Politics, p. 253. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, footnote, p. 440. Cadoux protests the interpretations of both Baker and Cunningham.

they made allowance for it, and looked on quietly while Christian officers made the sign of the cross at the sacrifices.'"[1]

Westermarck observes: "'The number of Christians enrolled in the army seems not to have been very considerable before the era of Constantine.'"[2]

Ramsay, in writing of the period A.D. 120-170, says: "'The Church in Asia Minor seems to have held that Christians should live in society as far as possible, should act as members of the municipal senates, and serve as soldiers.'"[3]

The following is the belief of Moffatt: "'The extant literature of the Church down to the close of the 2nd cent. betrays no sense of military service as incompatible with Christianity.'"[4] Also "'the acceptance of the story (the Thundering Legion) proves not only that Christians must have been in the army but that their presence there did not raise the slightest sense of embarrassment or disapproval in the Church.'"[5]

The opinion of Cadoux concerning the period A.D. 70-110 to the effect that the Christian mind stopped short of pro-

---

[1] The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, ii. 58f. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, p. 574.

[2] The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas, i. 346. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, footnote, p. 580.

[3] The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170, p. 435. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, footnote, p. 266.

[4] Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, ii. 662b. Quoted by Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, footnote, p. 280.

[5] Ibid., ii. 663b. Cadoux, footnote, p. 280.

nouncing an unqualified condemnation of war, has been mentioned.[1] Of the same period he has this also to say: "We have practically no direct evidence whereby to test the state of Christian feeling at this time on the question as to how far, if at all, it was regarded as legitimate for a Christian to be a soldier. We can only say (1) that no Christian writing up to the end of our period contains any explicit statement to the effect that it was wrong for a Christian to be a soldier; (2) that these writings . . . record how one or two such men were actually admitted to the Christian Church by baptism without being asked (as far as we know) to resign their military calling: (3) that, after the conversion of the Philippian gaoler, there is no undoubted reference to any Christian soldier for a hundred and twenty years: (4) that probably no one at this time was compelled to be a soldier against his will: and (5) that the teaching of Jesus and Christian ethical teaching generally conflicted diametrically with the normal duties of the soldier."[2]

Of the next period, A.D. 110-180, Cadoux writes: "The precedents recorded in the New Testament, apart from any other considerations, compel us to admit the possibility of the existence of Christian soldiers at any period subsequent to the early Apostolic age. But down to the time of Marcus Aurelius, they must in any case have been very few,

---

[1] Footnote, p. 30.

[2] The Early Church and the World, p. 189f.

[3] Ibid., p. 276f.

nouncing an unqualified condemnation of war, has been mentioned.[1] Of the same period he has this also to say: "We have practically no direct evidence whereby to test the state of Christian feeling at this time on the question as to <u>how far, if at all, it was regarded as legitimate for a Christian to be a soldier</u>. We can only say (1) that no Christian writing up to the end of our period contains any explicit statement to the effect that it was wrong for a Christian to be a soldier; (2) that these writings . . . record how one or two such men were actually admitted to the Christian Church by baptism without being asked (as far as we know) to resign their military calling; (3) that, after the conversion of the Philippian gaoler, there is no undoubted reference to any Christian soldier for a hundred and twenty years; (4) that probably no one at this time was compelled to be a soldier against his will; and (5) that the teaching of Jesus and Christian ethical teaching generally conflicted diametrically with the normal duties of the soldier."[2]

Of the next period, A.D. 110-120, Cadoux writes: "The precedents recorded in the New Testament, apart from any other considerations, compel us to admit the <u>possibility</u> of the existence of Christian soldiers at any period subsequent to the early Apostolic age. But down to the time of Marcus Aurelius, they must in any case have been very few,

---

[1] Footnote, p. 30.

[2] <u>The Early Church and the World</u>, p. 189f.

[3] <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 27ef.

and those few must have been men converted when already in the army."[1]

"There is evidence to show," Cadoux further asserts, "that, during the period 180-250 A.D., considerable numbers of Christians served in the imperial armies, and that in many Christian minds . . . no reproach was felt to attach to their action."[2]

The last period with which Cadoux concerns himself is A.D. 250-313. Admitting that Christians served under imperial banners he adds this warning: "Christian opinion, even at this date, contrary to the usual idea, was still very far from being unanimous as to the propriety of military service for Christians . . ."[3]

Here is evidence that difference of opinion exists among historians as to the Christian attitude toward war, ranging from the belief of Baker and Cunningham that the Christians felt little, if any, repugnance to war, to that of Cadoux who appears to be convinced that up to the time of Constantine and his decisive victory, the group which tolerated soldiery and war was probably in the minority.

---

[1] The Early Church and the World, p. 417f.

[2] Ibid., p. 580.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

Through three centuries of time the attitude of the Christians toward war and its related phases has been traced. The period of instruction by Jesus Christ was the time of the implanting of principles and the enunciating of truths considered divine. Following the death of Jesus there was a time of development in church life, and a process of assimilation of the ideas which he had left as a permanent record of his earthly existence. Then the third century and the early beginning of the fourth was largely given over to an attempted reconciliation or relating of the principles of Jesus with the active affairs of worldly life. This last period was marked with a wide divergence of opinion, men with an ideal outlook upon life stating their convictions and exerting a powerful influence in the direction of their thought; but other men with more earthbound ideas and practices developing a trend and a font of public opinion toward a practical working relationship of Christian experience and conviction with the duties and responsibilities of state and the activities of work-a-day life.

Jesus taught his followers that life was the most valuable object upon earth. Personality was to be safeguarded. The development of character was of more importance and significance than any amount of material possessions. To accomplish this character-end Jesus taught his disciples and

followers to love one another. Vengeance was to be set aside, God being able to take care of such needed retaliation without assistance from man. Enemies were not to be treated as other men treated enemies, but as those who should be loved. Meekness and non-resistance were the true characteristics of those who loved God. The disciples were admonished to be as wise as serpents, but as harmless as doves. Not only was murder to be unlawful, but even the anger which might produce that dire consequence was forbidden.

The time of Jesus, however, was not one in which the Jews--to whom he taught almost exclusively--were subject to the bearing of arms and participating in warfare. Being exempt from such servitude no direct occasion opened itself to Jesus for the expression of any specific teaching on the problem of war itself. Hence the subject can be treated only from the angle of implied meaning, inferences to be drawn from specific principle.

This is not saying, nevertheless, that Jesus had no occasion upon which he <u>might</u> have spoken on the problem of war proper. He came in contact with Roman soldiers, and on one occasion in particular he dealt with a centurion, whose business, necessarily, was that of organized warfare. But Jesus spoke no word either of commendation or of judgment of the centurion; only the faith of the man was emphasized.

Jesus frequently spoke of peace. Those who were peacemakers were the children of God. It was peace that he left with his disciples and followers--not the peace of the world

but that peace which was beyond the comprehension of those earthly-minded. Over Jerusalem itself he wept, declaring that it was for her peace that he had concerned himself.

Against the Roman imperial organization and its conquest of the world Jesus spoke no specific judgment. But to his disciples he counseled that the actions of Christians were not to be like those of the Gentiles who maintained their place by force of leadership, but by the gentle persuasion of a life of humble service.

It is only by implication, therefore, that the attitude of Jesus can be determined. Exalting virtues and ends not capable of being secured by the rapacity and destruction of warfare it might be concluded that he would have spoken condemnation of war and participation in it by his followers. But the fact that the Jews were not subject to imperial conscription and no war near at hand was in progress to bring the attention of Jesus to it, he spoke no definite word on the subject.

The period of the activity of the Apostles was marked by much the same environmental circumstances as those which conditioned the life of Jesus. There was, of course, a wider contact with the world; more distant geographical points were touched. But the Jews were not yet affected in any material way by military influences. The Apostle Paul was beginning to reach the Gentile world. The converts seem in the large to have been from non-military groups. Here and there a man in the ranks was converted, such as the gaoler in Philippi

and the centurion to whom Peter was called after his vision of the clean and unclean beasts; in neither of these cases does the question of the nature of the occupation come to the fore.

The Apostle Paul established a rule that every convert as a general thing should remain in the task in which he was laboring when called. As far as the evidence permits this rule seems to have been applied to the soldier as well as to the slave.

The peaceful purpose of Christianity was emphasized. Non-resistance was preached. Murder was forbidden; strife was condemned; and love for all men was set as the ideal for human relationships. In the lives of the Apostles themselves a practice of their preaching was realized.

The Apostolic Fathers and other writers who were contemporary with them rejected in most part the war system. Peace was regarded as the original condition among men, and by all odds the most precious relationship, by means of which all wars could be brought to an end.

It is true, however, that these Christian writers were not brought into such direct contact with organized warfare that they were compelled to make a choice for or against participation in war. Tatian remarks that he declined military command, a conclusion to which he might come without molestation from the state.

There existed a widespread belief that Christ had brought into the world a peaceful spirit. The machinery

of war would be turned by those who followed Christ into the tools of agriculture. The Christians believed that resistance was not becoming to them, and readily acquiesed, at least in theory, to the idea that on no account should a blow be returned.

In spite of this peaceful and non-resistant teaching there appears in the latter part of the second century a legion of Christian soldiers in the army of Marcus Aurelius. Uncertain as the actual number may have been, there seems to be proof enough that Christians were really in the army to compel the student to accept the account as fact. Christians made use of the story to prove to the Romans that their presence might be found anywhere.

The third century brings the matter of Christian participation in the army out of the realm of tradition into the field of actual history. There is no concealing the fact that Christians were finding their way into the war system. No amount of protesting on the part of such Christian leaders as Tertullain and Origen could force the followers of Christ into a united policy on the subject of war. The very knowledge with us that such leaders questioned the possibility of a Christian being a soldier in the camp of the Romans proves beyond a doubt that there were those who accounted themselves believers who fought shoulder to shoulder with the worshippers of idols.

Not all of the Christians found it easy to reconcile their faith and participation in war. Those having conscien-

tious objections withdrew from the ranks--sometimes because of the closeness with which idolatrous worship was attached to the army life, but sometimes because of a conviction that war itself was un-christian.

The church was compelled to make rules to control the conduct of Christian soldiers. This in itself is proof that soldiers were members of the church, and intended to remain as such while they were active in the army.

It was remarked above that Christian leaders taught vigorously that war was not an activity among men to be indulged in by the followers of Christ. But even here there can be found no unqualified condemnation of war. Tertullian came very near to a wholesale adverse judgment of warfare; yet even he is forced to conclude that it was still possible to be a Christian soldier.

At the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth there is evidence that many Christians were in the Roman army. The desire on the part of Diocletian and Galerius to purge the ranks of them reveals that a sufficient number of Christians were in the army to cause anxiety on the part of the rulers.

It may therefore be seen that there had gradually grown up in the ranks of Christendom the opinion that the profession of soldiery and the confession of Christ might be harmonized. This had not come about immediately, but was the consequence of passing years. Gentiles in the army were converted to the faith and remained in their occupation, seldom

pausing to question the nature of their task; neither did the members of the church make any particular demands toward a change in occupation.

This is not saying, however, that the issue never came to a crisis, for it did. Individual soldiers came face to face with a choice of Christ or their remaining in the army. Yet the choice, it must be noted, was individual, and not collective, except in the case of persecution.

It must be finally concluded, therefore, that the problem of the Christian as a part of the war system was basically an individual and local one. The attitude of the early Christian was determined by his particular sensitivity to the demands of his faith. To those who appreciated the idealism in Christianity there was a constant tug away from carnal warfare; to those who were more earthly-minded the attempt to reconcile faith and task was successfully accomplished--but both groups were Christian to the extent of their spiritual capacity.

It is the opinion of the writer of this thesis that the first three centuries of the present era reveal that the Christians thought on the subject of war in much the same fashion as they have thought from that day to this; namely, the individual conscience must be the guide. Much as we might like to have the church rise on heavenly wings, as it were, to the idealism that is woven into the fabric of the teachings of Jesus, we must be content to judge the past by its willingness to be guided by the inner promptings of the

spirit to which it has listened.

It may be that the modern age will be enabled to interpret Christianity in terms more harmonious with those of the master Teacher it professes to follow than the ages which have gone before have been able to do.

# IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

"Acts of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul." Translated by Alexander Walker. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 523. The Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D., and James Donaldson, LL.D., Editors. American Reprint of the Edinburgh Edition. Revised and Chronologically Arranged, with Brief Prefaces and Occasional Notes, by A. Cleveland Coxe, D.D.[1] Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1885. 8 Vols. Volume VIII, p. 477-485.

These acts were studied in their entirety.

Alexander of Alexandria. "Epistle on the Arian Heresy and the Disposition of Arius." Translated by Rev. James B. H. Hawkins. TANF, Vol. VI, p. 291-302.

This epistle was studied in its entirety.

"Ambrose." An Ancient Syriac Document. Translated by Rev. B. P. Pratten. TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 739-741.

This document was studied in its entirety.

Archelaus, bishop of Caschar in Mesopotamis. "The Acts of the Disputation With the Heresiarch Manes." Translated by Rev. S. D. F. Salmond. TANF, Vol. VI, p. 179-233.

These acts were studied in their entirety.

---

[1]Referred to throughout this thesis as TANF.

Primary Sources

"Acts of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul." Translated by Alexander Walker. The Ante-Nicene Library. Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325. The Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D., and James Donaldson, LL.D., Editors. American Reprint of the Edinburgh Edition. Revised and Chronologically Arranged, with Brief Prefaces and Occasional Notes, by A. Cleveland Coxe, D.D.[1] Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1886. 8 Vols. Volume VIII, p. 477-503.

These acts were studied in their entirety.

Alexander of Alexandria. "Epistle on the Arian Heresy and the Deposition of Arius." Translated by Rev. James B. M. Mawkins. TAPE, Vol. VI, p. 291-302.

This epistle was studied in its entirety.

"Ambrose." An Ancient Syriac Document. Translated by Rev. W. P. Pratten. TAPE, Vol. VIII, p. 739-741.

This document was studied in its entirety.

Archelaus, Bishop of Caschar in Mesopotamia. "The Acts of the Disputation With the Heresiarch Manes." Translated by Rev. S. D. F. Salmond. TAPE, Vol. VI, p. 179-233.

These acts were studied in their entirety.

---

[1]Refers to throughout this thesis as TAPE.

Arnobius. "The Seven Books of Arnobius Against the Heathen." Adversus Gentes.[1] Translated by Archdeacon Hamilton Bryce and Hugh Campbell. TANF, Vol. VI, p. 413-539.

These books were studied in their entirety.

Athenagoras the Athenian: Philosopher and Christian. "A Plea for the Christians." Translated by Rev. B. P. Pratten. TANF, Vol. II, p. 129-148.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On the Resurrection of the Dead." Translated by Rev. B. P. Pratten. TANF, Vol. II, p. 149-162.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Barnabas. "The Epistle of Barnabas." Translator not named.[2] TANF, Vol. I, p. 137-149.

This epistle was studied in its entirety.

Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis. "From an Unknown Book." Translated by Rev. B. P. Pratten. TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 772-773.

This portion was studied in its entirety.

Clement of Alexandria. "Exhortation to the Heathen." TANF, Vol. II, p. 171-206.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Instructor." Paedagogus. TANF, Vol. II, p. 209-296.

This work was studied in its entirety.

---

[1] When available the original title is given and underlined.

[2] When the name of the translator is not available no reference to the translating will be made in this bibliography.

"The Stromata, or Miscellanies." Stromata. TANF, Vol. II, p. 299-567.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"Who is the Rich Man That Shall Be Saved?" TANF, Vol. II, p. 591-604.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Clement of Rome. "The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians." TANF, Vol. I, p. 5-21.

This epistle was studied in its entirety.

"The First Epistle of the Blessed Clement, the Disciple of Peter the Apostle." Translated by Rev. B. B. Pratten. TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 55-60.

This epistle was studied in its entirety.

"The Clementine Homilies."[1] Books I. to V. have been translated by Rev. Thomas Smith; Books VI.-XII. by Peter Peterson; and Books XIII.-XX. by Dr. Donaldson. TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 223-346.

These homilies were studied in their entirety.

"Recognitions of Clement."[1] Translated by Rev. Thomas Smith. TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 75-211.

These recognitions were studied in their entirety.

Commodianus. "The Instructions of Commodianus in Favour of Christian Discipline, Against the Gods of the Heathen." Translated by Rev. Robert Ernest Wallis. TANF, Vol. IV, p. 203-218.

These instructions were studied in their entirety.

---

[1] Pseudo-Clementine Literature. It can find a place in the bibliography better here than elsewhere.

Cyprian. "Exhortation to Martyrdom, Addressed to Fortunatus." Ad Fortunatus, or de Exhortatione Martyrii. Translated by Rev. Ernest Wallis.[1] TANF, Vol. V, p. 496-507.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On Jealousy and Envy." De Zelo et Livore. TANF, Vol. V, p. 491-496.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On the Advantage of Patience." De Bono Patientiae. TANF, Vol. V, p. 484-491.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On the Glory of Martyrdom." De Laude Martyrii. TANF, Vol. V, p. 579-587.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On the Lapsed." De Lapsis. TANF, Vol. V, p. 437-477.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On the Lord's Prayer." TANF, Vol. V, p. 447-507.

This was studied in its entirety.

"On the Mortality." De Mortalitate. TANF, Vol. V, p. 469-475.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On the Unity of the Church." De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate. TANF, Vol. V, p. 421-429.

This was studied in its entirety.

"Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews." Testimonia aduersus Iudaeos (ad Quirinum). TANF,

---

[1] He has translated all of the works of Cyprian given here.

Vol. V, p. 507-557.

These books were studied in their entirety.

"To Donatus." Ad Donatus. TANF, Vol. V, p. 275-280.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"To Pompey, Against the Epistle of Stephen about the Baptism of Heretics." TANF, Vol. V, p. 386-390.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"To Rogatianus the Presbyter, and the Other Confessors." TANF, Vol. V, p. 283-285.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Dionysius of Alexandria. "A Commentary on the Beginning of Ecclesiastes." Translated by Rev. S. D. F. Salmond. TANF, Vol. VI, p. 111-114.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"From the Books on Nature." Translated by Rev. S. D. F. Salmond. TANF, Vol. VI, p. 84-91.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Eusebius Pamphilus. The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus, Bishop of Caesarea, in Palestine. Translated from the Greek by the Rev. C. F. Cruse. With notes selected from the edition of Valesius. London: George Bell & Sons, York St. Covent Garden, and New York, 1892.

This history was studied in its entirety.

Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. "To Cyprian, Against the Letter of Stephen." Translated by Rev.

Ernest Wallis. TANF, Vol. V, p. 390-397.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Hermas. "The Pastor of Hermas." Translated by Rev. F. Crombie. TANF, Vol. II, p. 9-55.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Hippolytus. "Discourse by the Most Blessed Hippolytus, Bishop and Martyr, on the End of the World, and On Antichrist, and On the Second Coming of Our Lord Jesus Christ." Translated by Rev. J. H. MacMahon. TANF, Vol. V, p. 242-255.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"Canons of the Church of Alexandria." Translated by Rev. J. H. MacMahon. TANF, Vol. V, p. 257-258.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Discourse on the Holy Theophany." Translated by Rev. J. H. MacMahon. TANF, Vol. V, p. 234-237.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Refutation of All Heresies." Refutatio omnium haeresium. Translated by Rev. J. H. MacMahon. TANF, vol. V, p. 9-153.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Ignatius. "Epistle to the Ephesians." TANF, Vol. I, p. 49-58.

This epistle was studied in its entirety, and in both the shorter and longer versions.

"Epistle to the Philadelphians." TANF, Vol. I, p. 79-85.

This epistle was studied in its entirety, and in both the shorter and longer versions.

Ireaneus. "Against Heresies." Adversus Haereses. TANF, Vol. I, p. 315-567.

This work was studied in its entirety.

James. "The Divine Liturgy of James, the Holy Apostle and Brother of the Lord." TANF, Vol. VII, p. 537-550.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Justin Martyr. "First Apology." TANF, Vol. I, p. 163-187.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Second Apology of Justin for the Christians. Addressed to the Roman Senate." TANF, Vol. I, p. 188-193.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Lactantius. "Of the Manner in Which the Persecutors Died." De Mortibus Persecutorum. Translated by William Fletcher. TANF, Vol. VII, p. 301-322.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Divine Institutes." Divinae Institutiones. Translated by Rev. William Fletcher. TANF, Vol. VII, p. 9-223.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Epitome of the Divine Institutes." Translated by Rev. William Fletcher. TANF, Vol. VII, p. 224-255.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Methodius. "Oration on the Palms." Translated by Rev. William R. Clark. TANF, Vol. VI, p. 394-398.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Banquet of the Ten Virgins; or, Concerning Chastity." Translated by Rev. William H. Clark. TANF, Vol. VI, p. 309-355.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Minucius Felix. "The Octavius of Minucius Felix." Translated by Rev. Robert Ernest Wallis. TANF, Vol. IV, p. 173-198.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Nemesianus. "The Reply of Nemesianus, Dativus, Felix, and Victor, to Cyprian." Translated by Rev. Ernest Wallis. TANF, Vol. V, p. 404-405.

New Testament. The New Covenant Commonly Called the New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Translated out of the Greek, Being the Version set Forth A.D. 1611. Compared with the Most Ancient Authorities and Revised A.D. 1881. Newly Edited by the New Testament Members of the American Revision Committee, A.D. 1900. Standard Edition. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.

The New Testament was studied in its entirety.

Origen. "Against Celsus." Contra Celsum. Translated by Rev. Frederick Crombie. TANF, Vol. IV, p. 395-669.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"De Principiis." De Principiis. Translated by Rev. Frederick Crombie. TANF, Vol. IV, p. 239-382.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Polycarp. "The Epistle to the Philippians." TANF, Vol. I, p. 33-36.

This epistle was studied in its entirety.

Pontius the Deacon. "The Life and Passion of Cyprian, Bishop and Martyr." TANF, Vol. V, p. 267-274.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Pseud-Irenaeus. "The Letter of the Churches of Vienna and Lugdunum to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia." Translated by Rev. B. P. Pratten. TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 778-784.

This work was studied in its entirety.

St Adaeus the St. Maria. "The Liturgy of the Blessed Apostles." TANF, Vol. VII, p. 561-568.

Tatian. "Address to the Greeks." Oratio ad Graexos. Translated by J. E. Ryland. TANF, Vol. II, p. 65-83.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"Teaching of the Twelve Aposltes. The Lord's Teaching Through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations." TANF, Vol. VII, p. 377-382.

This work was studied in its entirety.

Tertullian. "Ad Martyras." Ad Martyres. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 693-696.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"Ad Nationes." Ad Nationes. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 109-147.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"An Answer to the Jews." Aduersus Judaeos. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 151-173.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"Apology." Apologeticus. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 17-55.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On Idolatry." De Idololatria. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 61-76.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On Patience." De Patientia. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 707-717.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On the Pallium." De Pallio. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. IV, p. 5-12.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Chaplet, or De Corona." De Corona. Translated by S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 93-103.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Five Books Against Marcion." Aduersus Marcionem. Translated by Dr. Holmes. TANF, Vol. III, p. 269-474.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Shows, or De Spectaculis." De Spectaculis. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 79-91.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"To Scapula." Ad Scapulam. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 105-108.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"Apology." Apologeticus. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 17-55.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On Idolatry." De Idololatria. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 61-70.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On Patience." De Patientia. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 707-717.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"On the Pallium." De Pallio. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. IV, p. 5-12.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Chaplet, or De Corona." De Corona. Translated by S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 93-103.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Five Books Against Marcion." Adversus Marcionem. Translated by Dr. Holmes. TANF, Vol. III, p. 269-474.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Shows, or De Spectaculis." De Spectaculis. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 79-91.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"To Scapula." Ad Scapulam. Translated by Rev. S. Thelwall. TANF, Vol. III, p. 105-108.

This work was studied in its entirety.

"The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Translated by Rev. Robert Sinker. TANF, Vol. VIII, p. 9-38. The entire work was read, but two in particular were studied; i.e., II.--The Testament of Simeon Concerning Envy; and IX.--The Testament of Gad Concerning Hatred.

Theophilus of Antioch. "Theophilus to Autolycus." Translated by Rev. Marcus Dods. TANF, Vol. II, p. 89-121. This work was studied in its entirety.

Secondary Sources

Allen, William, and Myers, D. V. V. Ancient History for Colleges and High Schools. Part II: "A Short History of the Roman People." Boston: Ginn & Company, 1890. The pages studied are 253; 267; 300.

Alzoa, John. Manual of Universal Church History. Translated, with Additions, from the Ninth and Last German Edition, by F. J. Pabisch and Thos. S. Byrne. In 3 Vols. Cincinnati: Robert Clark & Co., 1874. Pages studied are in Vol. I, pages 207-210; 262-303.

Arnold, W. T. The Roman System of Provincial Administration to the Accession of Constantine the Greek. The Third Edition. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1914. The pages studied are 2; 187; 192; 194.

Ayer, Joseph Cullen. A Source Book for Ancient Church History from the Apostolic Age to the Close of the Concilian Period. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons,

1926.

The pages studied are 1-271.

Bennett, Charles W. "Christian Archaeology." In Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, Vol. IV. New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1888.

The pages studied are 461-474; 509.

Blackburn, W. M. History of the Christian Church from Its Origin to the Present Time. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe, 1881.

The pages studied are 18-73.

Brock, Mourant. Rome: Pagan and Papal. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1883.

The pages studies are 1-34.

De Pressense, E. "Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church." The Early Years of Christianity. Translated by Annie Harwood-Holmden. New York: Nelson & Phillips, 1878.

The pages studied are 7-262; 324-521.

"The Apostolic Era." The Early Years of Christianity. Translated by Annie Harwood. New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1879.

The pages studied are 3-19; 381-397.

"The Martyrs and Apologists." The Early Years of Christianity. Translated by Annie Harwood. New York: Carlton and Lanahan, 1871.

The pages studied are 67-509; 572-575.

Dryer, George H. History of the Christian Church. In 5 Vols. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye, 1896.

Pages studied are in Vol. I, pages 49-156.

Eddy, Sherwood and Kirby Page. The Abolition of War and the Case Against War and Questions and Answers Concerning War. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1924.

The pages studied are 29-34; 75-85.

Farrar, Frederic W. The Early Days of Christianity. New York: A. L. Burt, Publisher, 1882.

The pages studied are 34-72.

Fisher, George P. History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1888.

The pages studied are 37-86.

The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1890.

The pages studied are 546-580.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The History of the Christian Church from the Earliest Times to A.D. 461. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1891. Seventh Edition, 1924.

The pages studied are 29-121; 228-239; 285.

Gibbon, Edward. The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, with Notes by the Rev. H. H. Milman. A New Edition, to Which is Added a Complete Index of the Whole Work. 6 Vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1850.

Gieseler, J. C. I. Text-Book of Ecclesiastical History. Translated from the Third German Edition by Francis Cunningham. 3 Vols. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, and Blanchard. n. d.

The pages studied are Vol. I, p. 46-123; 169-175.

Hodges, George. The Early Church from Ignatius to Augustine. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915.

The pages studied are 30-93.

Hurst, John F. Outline of Church History. Revised Edition. New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1883.

The pages studied are 11-28.

Short History of the Christian Church. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1896.

The pages studied are 3-38.

John, Bishop of Lincoln. The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, Illustrated from the writings of Tertullian. Third Edition. London: Francis & John Rivington, 1845.

The pages studied are 85-151; 208-242.

Jones, H. Stuart. The Roman Empire B.C. 29-A.D. 476. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, n. d.

Only page 337 was studied.

Jones, William. The History of the Christian Church from the Birth of Christ to the Eighteenth Century; including the Very Interesting Account of the Waldenses and Albigenses. 2 Vols. The Fourth Edition. London:

W. Myers, 1819.

The pages studied are Vol. I, p. 221-286; 297-308.

Leighton, R. F. A History of Rome, Amply Illustrated with Maps, Plans, and Engravings. New York: Clark & Maynard, 1880.

The pages studied are 475-477; 490.

Merivale, Charles. History of the Romans Under the Empire. New Edition in 8 Vols. New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1896.

The pages studied are 435-472 of Vol. VI; p. 136-153 of Vol. VIII.

Milman, Henry Hart. History of Latin Christianity, Including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V. 8 Vols. in 4. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Sons, 1886.

The pages studied are 41-93 of the combined Vols. I and II.

The History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire. 3 Vols. A New and Revised Edition. New York: W. J. Widdleton, Publisher, 1866.

The pages studied are 5-218.

Milner, Joseph. The History of the Church of Christ; from the Times of the Apostles to the Rise of the Papal Apostacy. Second Edition. London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1844.

The pages studied are 1-310.

Neander, Augustus. General History of the Christian Church: from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated

from the Second and Improved Edition, by Joseph Terry. Vol. I. Sixth American Edition. Boston: Crocker & Brewster; London: Wiley & Putnam, 1853.

The pages studied are 69-277.

History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles. With the Author's Final Additions. Also, His Antignostikus; or, Spirit of Tertullian. Translated from the Berman of J. E. Ryland. 2 Vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1891.

The pages studied are 209-310; 349-390 of Vol. II.

Memorials of Christian Life in the Early and Middle Ages including His Light in Dark Places. Translated from the German of J. E. Ryland. London: George Bell and Sons, 1885.

The pages studied are 1-117.

Newman, Albert Henry. A Manual of Church History. Vol. I, "Ancient and Mediaeval Church History (to A.D. 1517)." Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1900.

The pages studied are 147-172; 211-301 of Vol. I.

Page, Kirby. The Sword of the Cross. An Examination of War in the Light of Jesus' Way of Life. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1921.

The pages studied are 26-45.

Purves, George T. Christianity in the Apostolic Age. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.

The pages studied are 34-40.

Ropes, James Hardy. The Apostolic Age in the Light of Modern Criticism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

The pages studied are 169-206.

Schaff, Philip: History of the Christian Church. Vol. I: "From the Birth of Christ to the Reign of Constantine, A.D. 1-311." New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1871.

The pages studied are 53-114; 302-341 of Vol. I.

Sheldon, Henry C. History of the Christian Church. Vol. I: "The Early Church." New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & C. 1894.

The pages studied are 129-192; 293-323 of Vol. I.

Simkhovitch, V. F. Toward the Understanding of Jesus. New York: The MacMillian Company, 1923.

This work was studied in its entirety, p. 1-94.

Sohm, Rudolf. A History of Christianity. Kirchengeschichte im Grundiss. From the German of Prof. Rudolph Sohm by Charles W. Rishell, with Revisions, Notes and Additions. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891.

The pages studied are 9-41; 96-98.

Ulhorn, Gerhard. The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism. Edited and Translated with the Author's Sanction from the Third German Edition by Egbert C. Smyth and C. J. H. Ropes. Revised Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1879.

The pages studied are 150-297; 336-342; 355-419.

Waddington, George. A History of the Church from the Earliest Ages to the Reformation. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1871.

The pages studied are 30-69.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.

The pages studied are 33-44.

Wellock, Wilfred. War As Viewed by Jesus and the Early Church. Published by the No More War Movement. London: W. C. 1, n. d.

This work was studied in its entirety. p. 5-31.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02570 4083